

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XVII
NUMBER 1

JANUARY, 1909

WHOLE
NUMBER 161

HIPPIAS PAIDAGOGOS

PAUL SHOREY
The University of Chicago

Historical parallels are dangerous playthings for less genial and ingenious writers than Plutarch. But President Hall will hardly repudiate, for he seems to invite, the one which lends a title to this discussion of his latest book. "To be a universal adept like Hippias suggests Diderot and the encyclopedists in the intellectual realm," he says (p. 58). And in the chapter on industrial education he complacently informs us that "as a student in Germany I took a few lessons each of a book-binder, a glass-blower, a shoemaker, a plumber, and a blacksmith . . . and I am proud that I can still mow and keep my scythe sharp; chop, plow, milk, churn, make cheese and soap, braid a palm-leaf hat complete, knit, spin, and even "put in a piece" in an old-fashioned hand loom, and weave frocking."

Similarly, it will be remembered, Hippias boasted that besides being an expert in literature, science, and education he had appeared at Olympia wearing only articles made by his own hands, his ring and seal, his strigil and oil flask, his shoes, cloak, tunic, and girdle of costly Persian fabric.

Nor does the analogy end here. Hippias had made vast collections of facts in ethnology and folk-lore which he easily memorized and recited to such audiences as preferred them to his more technical lectures on cosmology and the psychology of rhythm. He was the author of a popular and edifying work

on adolescence in which he set forth "what pursuits and practices are right and honorable for youth." He was an ardent advocate of nature and natural methods as opposed to the arbitrary conventions that stunt the free expansion of the soul. If Latin grammar had then been invented he would have welcomed with enthusiasm the emancipating proclamation "that no grammar and least of all that derived from the prim meager Latin . . . is adequate to legislate for the free spirit of our magnificent tongue." He was master of a highly-wrought rhetorical style adorned with bold imagery, technical and scientific allusion, and cumulation of synonyms. Conscious of these merits he was extremely impatient of those petty and quibbling critics who "morselize instead of presenting wholes." He, too, held that "over-accuracy is atrophy." He, too, thought that it was "low tackle" in Socrates to hold up the flights of exuberant youth "by forever being on the hunt for errors." He, too, would "rather be convicted of many errors by such methods than use them." And if, in the course of these observations, I exhibit anything of the carping captiousness of the philological and dialectical mind, the modern Hippias will doubtless thank me for supplying him in advance in fair though free paraphrase with the retort of his ancient prototype in like case: "Now what is all this, my friend, but splinterings and cheeseparings of controversy? The trouble with you and your disciples is that you don't look at things as wholes. But you separate off and isolate and thresh out and cavil upon and mince up and fly-blow some picayunish point of definition or relevancy; and so you miss the large and liberal phylogenetic view of the school-boy and the continuity of nature and the solidarity of existence which we take in the Paedagogical Seminary."

In spite of President Hall's breezy panegyric of slang and his denunciation of "linguistic manicuring," I must begin by saying that his style is deplorable. Its energy and vivacity are incommunicable gifts of temperament. Its vice is precisely that to which clever American youth is already too prone—a straining for emphasis, picturesqueness, and point at any cost of impropriety of phrase, grotesque metaphor, false antithesis, or

abuse of irrelevant scientific technicalities. Of what avail is it for the tutor in English to rise up early and take rest late in the endeavor to purge sophomoric rhetoric and eradicate the freshman's natural taste for bathos if the president of the university lets himself go in this fashion? (p. 44): "If not a polyphrastic philosophy seeking to dignify the occupation of the workshop by a pretentious Volapük of reasons and abstract theories, we have here the pregnant suggestion of a psychological quarry of motives and spirit opened and ready to be worked." Imagine President Eliot proposing "a true scale of standardized culture values for efferent processes." Or conceive of an eminent French writer saying that "crime is cryptogamous," or talking about rudimentary *organs* of the soul *cropping* out in menacing forms or being developed so that we should be *immune* to them on the principle of the Aristotelian *κάθαρσις*.

These and similar perversities are not the occasional lapses of the austere specialist careless of verbal niceties, but the systematic affectations of the ambitious rhetorician striving to dazzle. To the same source we may refer the wanton inaccuracies in quotation, etymology, literary allusions, and *obiter dicta*, singly trifling but collectively indicative of a temper the reverse of scientific. It is not necessary to quote Latin or allude to Greek. But if you do you must not talk of "agolasts," or write *valare est philosophari* or *vivere est cogitari*. Nobody is obliged to etymologize; and President Hall, indeed, when assailing the elementary study of Latin deprecates a "consciousness of etymologies which rather impedes than helps the free movement of the mind." But he surely abuses his freedom when he tells us that "heteronomous" means "having a different name," and proclaims that "the good teacher is now a pedotrieb or boy driver," apparently deriving Παιδοτρίβης from Greek Παις and German *treiben*. By parity of etymologizing a paedagog would be one who sets the boys agog. It is better to omit quotation and anecdote altogether than to tell your readers that Pindar said "only he is great who is great with his hands and feet," or that Plato *reproached* Aristotle with being a reader, or that the old Roman pronunciation of Latin is un-

known and unrecognized in the schools of the European continent, or that "at a brilliant examination a candidate for the doctor's degree who had answered many questions concerning the forms of Lucretius, when asked whether he was a dramatist, historian, poet, or philosopher, did not know and his professor deemed the question improper." This last anecdote has been widely repeated by reviewers and will doubtless long survive in paedagogical literature. It will serve as well as another for an issue. It is on its face absolutely impossible. President Hall was either the victim of an absurd hoax; or he is permitting himself a license of affirmation which justifies us in a certain reserve when he assures us elsewhere, on the authority of statistics which we cannot control, that dolichocephalous students do not elect Greek.

These trifles are merely symptomatic of the main defect of the book, that its temper and method are rhetorical, not scientific. The evolution of the thought proceeds not by consecutive, relevant reasoning but by the old rhetorical method of the amplification of "topics," commonplaces, and favorite ideas. This merely rhetorical amplification alternates, it is true, with amplification by statistics and anecdote. But the essential procedure is the same. Ideas are developed, illustrated, emphasized in casual juxtaposition or false antithesis. They are not linked in a coherent sequence of exposition or argument. Except in the last two chapters, of which more later, we search the book in vain for any unity of purpose or consistent educational ideal. It is merely an "imperfect conflation of psychological view-points," to characterize Hippias in his own peculiar style.

I do not mean that there are no good ideas in the book. So alert and receptive a mind as President Hall's inevitably assimilates ideas even from opponents. I cordially concur with the statement that as regards the mastery of certain indispensable elements in youth "pedagogic art consists in breaking the child into them betimes as intensely and as quickly as possible with minimal strain and with the least amount of explanation or coquetting for natural interest." And I can almost fancy that I

am reperusing a forgotten paper of my own¹ when I read on pp. 249, 250 that "in modern pedagogy there is an increased tyranny of things, a growing neglect or exclusion of all that is unseen;" that in consequence "the psychic operations of our school youth today are "of the elementary and half-animal kind that consists in imagery;" and that "it is as if what are sometimes called the associative fibers, both ends of which are in the brain, were dwarfed in comparison with the afferent and efferent fibres that mediate sense and motion." But I am quite unable to correlate these isolated *aperçus* with the exaggerated stress laid on manual and muscle training, with the attack on Latin grammar, with the deprecation of all analysis implied in the anecdote "I can do and understand this perfectly if you only wont explain it," or with the statistics of school girls' favorite names to which he turns "in this deplorable condition" to find that "the child once set in the midst again corrects the wise men." Is it by encouraging or suppressing their statistically demonstrated preference for "Helen" and "Bessie" that young ladies are to be given "resources in solitude" and taught "to think abstractly without the visual provocation"?

It is not ideas that we lack today, but criticism, sanity, and a sense of proportion to harmonize and reduce them to order. Mere ideas are as plentiful as blackberries and as infectious as germs. President Hall's system is saturated with them. He is an eminently "suggestive" writer. He suggests, for example, that football "supplies topics for terse, vigorous, and idiomatic theme writing," and "lays instructors under the necessity of being more interesting, that their work be not jejune or dull by contrast." "I think of as many matters as he; but I give heaven thanks and make no boast of them," the dazed reader cries after his break-neck, zigzag course across the fields of evo-

¹"Discipline vs. Dissipation in Secondary Education," *The School Review*, April, 1897, p. 217 ff.; e.g., p. 227: "But while we are educating the central nervous system in the reception and retention of sense images, let us see to it that we do not let slip the few short years in which it is possible to establish lines of relation between sense images, and gradually elaborate the raw material of thought into the higher, more economic, and more effective form of ideas."

lutionary psychology, physiology of the muscles, manual training, sloyd, the history of gymnastics, plays, sports, and games, and anecdotal biographies of Napoleon, Agassiz, Chatterton, Marie Bashkirtseff, and Mary MacLane, with digressions on Aristotle's *κἀθαρσις*, Rembrandt als Erzieher, choreic tics, the English pronunciation of Latin, Hughling Jackson's three-level theory, the accessory muscular system, verbigerations, automatisms, onychophagia, athletic records, dolls, dancing, Bushido, anti-aphrodisiac cold baths, the psychology of telegraphy, the quest of maximum metabolism in truancy, New York gangs, school girls' ideals, German duels, and the number of words in the English language. But if he asks for the concernancy and relevancy of it all he is answered only by the sledge-hammer strokes of rhetoric with which each idea is emphasized as it happens to present itself. The author's personal enthusiasm for the topics of the successive chapters as representative of his own past ethnological and psychological studies is the only unifying educational principle in the book. There is undoubtedly an intense conviction that education is somehow to be reformed by motor training, child study, *questionnaires*, and the far-fetched analogies of biological evolution. We are promised mountains and marvels for the future, but at present the mountain is delivered only of truism or paradox.

We are all aware of the advantages of farm life in youth and the harmful effects of bad air and confinement in the city school-room. It is not ignorance but want of will, money, and energy that leaves the heating and ventilation even of university classrooms so defective. It is not necessary to tabulate 700 sports of 2,000 children in order to reach the sapient conclusion (p. 85), "parents and society must therefore provide the most favorable conditions for the kind of amusement fitting at each age." Lindley's study of 897 motor automatisms in children divided into 82 classes supplies no firmer basis for practical paedagogy than Plato's observation that the young are naturally incapable of keeping still and that we should therefore direct their movements into healthful, rhythmic, and gracious forms. Mothers and teachers will not deal more tact-

fully with bad habits for learning to call them "motor combinations that will need laborious decomposition." If "Colegrove concludes from his data that the period of adolescence is one of great psychical awakening" he concludes nothing that everybody who has ever observed a growing boy or girl has not already concluded.

It arrests the attention to be told (p. 275) that "after twenty . . . the male acquires more and the female less visual and auditory memories." But everybody knows that though it may be true of a Turk and his harem it is not true of an American college professor and his wife. Some readers will find profundity in the statement (p. 237) that "both mental and moral acquisition sink at once too deep to be reproduced by examination without injury both to intellect and will. But it remains true that if there has been too much competitive examination in England the flabbiness of American scholarship is largely due to the fact that owing to our naïve acceptance of such *dicta* as this we have now too little. The statistically established statement (p. 211) that "what seems to be most appreciated in teachers is the giving of purpose, arousing of ideals, kindling of ambition"—in short, "inspiration," could be foretold by anyone who reflects that this is both the conventional and the only interesting thing to say, and that it would be intolerably prosaic to approve a teacher because he knew his subject and helped the student to know it.

Nothing emerges from the long chapter of biographical anecdote and the modest admission of eminent men that they owed nothing to their teachers, unless it be the inference that it is better to be a poor student than a good one. This will always be a popular view, and, life being very complicated, it is sometimes true; but we can hardly be expected to preach it in the classroom.

As for the pseudo-scientific jargon and the lessons of evolution neither courtesy nor common-sense requires us to take them seriously. President Eliot, I believe, once said that our problems are our own, and that we have nothing to learn from the educational experience of the Renaissance. I am not sure

that this is quite so. But however respectfully we may treat him in the teachers' conference or the paedagogical seminary we are all perfectly well aware that our still more remote ancestor, "the tidal ascidian," has nothing to do with the matter in hand. "Phylogenetic motivation" is no improvement on Plato's *κατὰ φύσιν*. The profound scientific observation that "by right mastication we are thus developing speech organs" may be allowed to pair off with the no less significant discovery of Professor Lewis Carroll that the process is reversible:

I took to the law
And argued each case with my wife,
And the muscular strength that it gave to my jaw
Has lasted the rest of my life.

The phylo-onto-genetic argument that education ought to recapitulate the life of the race can be made to prove anything. It will supply a plausible reason for compulsory Greek, thus: the small boy will recapitulate the age of stone-throwing and cave-dwelling without external aid; but in order that the adolescent may recapitulate the Renaissance he should be compelled to study Greek. In short, these pretentious applications of biological and evolutionary analogies to the practical educational and social problems of modern man are precisely on a level with the reversed evolution of Plato's *Timaeus* which tells us that the Demiurgus endowed man with rudimentary nails or claws in prescience of the day when he would degenerate into woman and other animals and need them. The only difference is that Plato knew that he was joking, and our modern doctors do not know either that he was or that they are.

These strictures, as already hinted, do not apply to the two concluding chapters on "The Education of Girls" and on "Moral and Religious Training." Here President Hall is not trying to extract educational cucumbers from the moonshine of the paedagogical seminary, but is arguing out of an earnest conviction vigorously, consecutively, and lucidly to definite conclusions; and, whether we accept or reject his final opinion on these high and delicate matters, no fair-minded critic can fail to recognize the sanity, breadth, and temperateness of his

discussion of them. *O si sic omnia.* The quality of these chapters both in content and (in the main) in style raises the doubt whether I ought not to cancel what I have said of the remainder of the book. But I think not. In the prevailing timidity and complaisance of American criticism the writer who has in any way achieved distinction is undefended against his worser inspirations by any check save his own scientific and literary conscience. Vivacity, picturesqueness, "suggestiveness," energy, the public appreciates. But there is nobody to apply the ferule to the knuckles of a college president if in straining after these qualities he permits himself aberrations of taste and logic which the educated opinion of older civilizations would not tolerate, and which almost justify Kipling's sneer at "the picture-writing of a half-civilized people."

WHAT THE WEST WANTS IN PREPARATORY ENGLISH

F. N. SCOTT

The University of Michigan

I have often wished that the term preparatory, together with the ideas that cluster about it, might be dropped for a season from our educational vocabulary. My aversion to the term arises from a conviction that it is in part responsible for one of the most serious of educational fallacies, or if not directly responsible, serves at any rate to keep the fallacy in countenance. The fallacy to which I refer is the prevalent belief that the chief purpose of secondary English is to prepare the student to enter the university.

I question whether any secondary study can be taught most successfully when it is pursued with that sole end in view, though in regard to history, science, and foreign languages, I yield to the authority of others. With reference to English, at any rate, I have no doubts; I am sure that the mental attitude on the part of either teacher or pupil which keeps the eye fixed on the university gate, which leads the teacher to test his teaching and the pupil to test his progress mainly by the question whether it meets the formal entrance requirements, is an unfortunate attitude which cannot fail to lower the value of the study. It is akin to the religious doctrine that entrance to Heaven can be gained by the performance of certain stated ceremonies, no matter what one's behavior has been in other regards.

In the West, where entrance is almost entirely upon certificate, the evil is minimized to a considerable extent. If a student, destined to enter a state university, is in an approved high school, the question of preparation need not be raised, except in a general way. In our western state systems, as is well known, one broad highway stretches from the kindergarten to the graduate school. All that is required for admission to the university is that the candidate keep in the middle of the road. By following this simple injunction, he finds himself in course of time on the university campus. But in the East, where entrance requirements mean entrance examinations, preparatory English is a different thing. It is the English which will enable candidates to pass the examination. Its substance, its

methods, and its arrangement in the curriculum are largely determined by the accidents, so to speak, of the entrance requirements.

Nor is this without its effect upon the West. There are in every large western high school a few pupils who are being prepared for eastern colleges. To meet the needs of these pupils the teacher must to some extent conform to eastern methods.

Still further, there has been an earnest attempt of late to bring the East and the West together in the matter of requirements, in order to secure essential uniformity of subject-matter and mode of study. As a result of this movement the attitude of the western teacher has either insensibly conformed to that of the eastern teacher, or has come into more or less embarrassing conflict with it.

Thus the West has been compelled by the course of events to face a problem which was not of its own creating, and from which, following its own methods, it would naturally be exempt. Since, however, the West has become thus involved, it is not improper for a representative of that region to seek to analyze the peculiar situation, to point out its dangers, and to suggest a remedy.

The effects of what I have called the preparatory fallacy may be distinguished as the effect upon the teacher, upon the pupil, and upon the course of study. I will speak briefly of these in turn, not attempting an exhaustive analysis, but rather singling out in each case the most striking characteristics.

First, then, what is its effect upon the teacher? Out of a variety of influences, I will mention but one, though an extremely important one—its tendency to debase the teacher's standard of values. Professor James has said recently that the highest reward which modern education can bestow upon any individual is the ability to estimate the worth of his fellow-men—the ability to detect instantly, under whatever disguises, the useful citizen, the incorruptible politician, the efficient man of affairs. I would apply a similar test to the equipment of the secondary teacher of English. I would say that his most precious endowment as a teacher is his ability to estimate the personal, intrinsic worth and promise of the students under his direction. Valuable as this gift is to all teachers, it is of peculiar value to the teacher of English, not only because through this subject he comes into closer personal contact with his students than can the teacher of any other subject, but because such personal contact is the only means by which the subject can be taught at all. His main business, we may say, is not simply to teach a language,

it is to develop human personality—to draw it out, to give it freedom of expression, and, when it has thus been developed, to know it through and through and to estimate it in and for itself. It is the duty and privilege of the teacher of English, far beyond that of any other teacher, to exercise the prophetic function, that is, to detect in the feeble, straggling plant of the present the promise of the bright consummate flower which is to unfold in later years in a different environment. This, I say, is his function and his opportunity; but if, instead of keeping his eyes upon his students' progress and estimating their worth by the growth of their personalities, the teacher is compelled to keep one eye on his class and the other on a set of examination questions, what will be the natural consequence? Is he not likely to acquire a squint? Is not his sense of personal values likely to be confused? I submit that such a result is almost inevitable. With the best intentions in the world, he will gradually cease to apply the standard of personal worth; he will learn to apply the standard of conformity to a more or less conventional requirement. As a result of this failure of the inward vision he may give up educating; he may begin just to prepare, even to coach.

I do not mean to bring this as a railing accusation against eastern teachers of English. Doubtless the sense for personal value is on the average as high in the East as it is in the West. But no one can deny, I think, that certain eastern teachers are much more preoccupied with the problem of getting particular boys into particular universities than are any western teachers. It is my observation that the burden of preparation weighs heavily upon them. And why should it not when failure to get a candidate through the university gate is accounted as little less than a crime? It would be strange, indeed, if this continual pressure did not sooner or later make crooked the teacher's standard of judgment.

If, now, we ask what secondary English means to the pupil, especially to the pupil who is looking toward a university career, we shall have no difficulty in tracing the baneful effect of the preparatory idea. There is the phrase "required reading," for example. Is it well that young persons should be led to think of literary appreciation as a "required" something? To my mind the very sound of the phrase is ominous and depressing, as if one should say required wonder, required reverence, required enjoyment. If I were asked to devise a method of quenching the proper interest

of high-school pupils in their English work or of so transforming their interest as to defeat the ends of sound education, I am sure I could find no better plan than to convince them that the main object of their study was to meet the entrance requirements. Such a conviction often cuts the heart out of the work, as many a teacher will testify.

I shall not soon forget the pathetic remark of a very earnest young candidate whom I met this summer and to whom I lent a copy of *Little Dorrit*. He returned it next day with the remark that he was afraid he would become interested in it. "You know," he added, rather sadly, "I am preparing for the entrance examinations at ——— University, and *Little Dorrit* is not on the list."

There are persons to whom this will seem to be an extreme case, yet I believe that it is fairly typical of a large body of secondary pupils—and teachers as well—for whom "English A" and "English B" have acquired the abstractness of algebraic symbols.

The effect of the preparatory fallacy upon the course of study is no less obvious. It is exhibited in a variety of ways, but perhaps the most serious aspect of it is the upsetting of the natural order of studies in order to turn the senior year into a purely preparatory or coaching period. Books which were read and, we may hope, enjoyed in the Freshman and Sophomore years, and which now have been properly forgotten, must be brought out and laboriously reread. The answers to the old questions must be committed to memory: Whether the Vicar preferred the blue bed to the brown, and why; the numbers of the *Spectator* in which the Sir Roger de Coverly papers appeared; the color of the gown worn by the cardinal in *Quentin Durward*; Is a barbarous age more favorable to the production of great poetry than an age of refinement?

It is a dreary process, but what else can be done? To attempt to bring back the first fine careless rapture, if happily there was one, would be absurd. Besides, the entrance requirements do not call for it. They call for facts, or else for delicate critical discriminations, outlines of plots, and pallid little essays on the character of Dunston Cass.

It is not uncommon, I believe, for the course of study to be so arranged that the entire list of books called for by the entrance requirements shall be either read or reviewed, and shall certainly be written about, in the senior year—this, as it seems to me, in defiance

of accepted principles of education and the suggestions of common-sense.

The same influence has been, at least in part, responsible for the unfortunate entanglement, in the preparatory schedule, of literature and composition. That any great gain comes to the student either in literary appreciation or in the command of his mother-tongue from the incessant writing of outlines of plots, critical estimates which ape maturity, or characterless sketches of character, has not, I believe, been demonstrated. On the other hand, it is the experience of most teachers with whom I have discussed the question, that such essays, especially as they appear in examination papers, are for the most part the merest fluff and ravelings of the adolescent mind, revealing neither the student's independent thought, nor, except casually, his command of English. They came into existence, I have been told, as a convenience for the examiner, who thus thought to combine in one paper questions on both sides of the pupil's training. The combination represents an accident of preparation, not an essential of secondary study.

Take the outlining of plots, for example. Valuable as is the practice of retelling a story in one's own words, when there is some object in it, as when it is directed to eager listeners or readers, there is still reason to doubt whether the reduction of dramas, or of the larger works of fiction, to bare synopses, is a wholly profitable exercise, especially where it is pursued systematically and mercilessly as it is in some schools. The results of such work are likely to be either juiceless "chankings"—if I may use a provincialism—or ludicrously inadequate attempts to hit off the style and spirit of the original. Moreover the plots of some of the best reading in the world are such as nobody wants to outline. Did anyone, I wonder, ever derive satisfaction from an outline of *As You Like It*? Not I, at any rate. Some years ago I attempted to read a number of exercises on that theme written by fairly able secondary students, but after the first half-dozen I gave the task over, fearing that if I continued I should lose all respect for the constructive art of Shakespeare. Or, to take another example, a work which I read with great enjoyment when I was young was the romance of *Don Quixote*. It is a book which every boy delights in and eagerly appropriates to himself. But would anyone, except a hard-driven teacher of English, expect profit to arise from outlining the plot of that incomparable piece of fiction? To ask the question is to answer

it. For my part, I am sure that I could no more outline the plot of that book than I could manipulate an aeroplane; and if I could, what good would it do?

But I will not prolong the enumeration of these evil conditions. Let us look on the obverse of the medal. Assume for the moment that the word preparatory has been dropped from the vocabulary of education. Suppose that instead of speaking of preparatory English we are to speak of educative English, or gainful English, or profitable English. Suppose, further, that the sole question which secondary teachers of this subject are compelled to ask themselves is just this: What course of instruction in English will contribute most to the pupil's mind and character, and to his powers of appreciation, expression, and communication? What would be the effect of so radical a change?

Its most important result and the only one that I shall consider, is that it would set the teacher free from prescription and routine. It would grant to him *Lehrfreiheit*, and give him opportunity to develop a more individual mode of teaching. It would enlarge his resources. In his choice of books for reading and study he would no longer be confined to a pitiful little list, selected often on grounds of convenience, or copyright, by persons of tastes and inclinations perhaps alien to his own; he could select at will out of the great storehouse of English and American literature the books which he had found by experience to be best fitted to his peculiar mode of instruction and to the needs of his pupils. He could arrange this reading in the order of chronology, or of relative difficulty, or in any other way that he chose. He could follow the path of his own interest and knowledge, and make his teaching contributory to his scholarship.

Such an emancipation of the teacher would throw upon him full responsibility for the pupils' gain or loss. He could no longer take refuge behind the entrance requirements and say, "I have been bidden to do thus and so. I have done it. Here are the beggarly results." He would be his pupils' keeper, answerable to his own conscience and to the world for the use he had made of his trusteeship.

But it may be asked, and with reason, what rights the institution of higher education retains when it has given up this prescription of particular books and particular methods of preparing students for examination. My answer is, that it would retain the privilege which

it has always had, of training secondary teachers for their duties, of giving them high ideals, of co-operating with them in their plans, of stimulating and encouraging them to do their utmost by reposing confidence in them. It would also, I suppose, retain, or assume, the privilege which we have long had in the West, of inspecting the teacher's work, of making suggestions for the improvement of it, and, perhaps most important of all, of testing the tree by its fruits as they ripen in the university atmosphere.

I am aware that this proposal will be received in some quarters with disapproval, not to say horror. The opinion is held by many eastern teachers that the only conserving force in secondary education, at least in the New England states, is the entrance examinations at certain universities. Graduates of these universities have said to me, with bated breath, that if the examinations were suspended, the whole system of secondary education would collapse and fall to the ground, like a bean-stalk when the pole is removed. For my part, I should hesitate to bring so serious a charge against eastern secondary teachers. I should hesitate to say that they are so lacking in conscience and independence of character that they can be kept to their work only by the lash of the taskmaster. I am unwilling to believe that this serfdom exists in the secondary schools either in the East or in the West. It is another educational fallacy. Some day somebody with a big ax will cut down the totem-pole which now stands in front of the eastern university. When it falls, there will be great consternation. The worshipers will cower and hide in crevices of the rocks, and wait for the offended deities to launch their thunderbolts. But nothing will happen. The deities will be on a journey, or peradventure asleep. Secondary education, after a little season of readjustment, will go on as usual. The good schools and good teachers will turn out good material, the poor schools and poor teachers will turn out poor material. About the same proportion of each kind as at present will find its way into the university. In course of time the poor schools will be discredited and will be compelled to do better work or go out of business. The good schools will be rewarded by increased confidence. I do not pretend to know when this transformation will take place, but that it will come in the fulness of time, I have not the slightest doubt.

If, however, the change of front which I have suggested is for the present impracticable, are there not some particulars in which the uniform requirements can be so modified as at once to improve the

instruction and to avoid a conflict between eastern and western ideals and methods? Since the problem is now being carefully studied by a committee of the Joint Conference on Entrance Requirements, I will not attempt to forestall their conclusions. But I will throw out a few suggestions.

In the first place, as I have already hinted, I am sure there would be a great gain if a vertical line could be drawn through the secondary curriculum between literature on one side, and composition on the other. Not that these two subjects fail in vital relationships and points of contact, but that the artificial alliance enforced by the terms of the entrance requirements and the character of the examinations has resulted in the evil conditions pointed out before. What I would suggest is that we put in one course of study literature and so much of critical theory and literary history as the pupil must have for the rational appreciation of what he reads; and that we put in another course of study training in composition, and so much grammatical and rhetorical theory as the pupil needs for the rationalizing of that discipline. Carry these two studies along side by side, letting one touch the other only when it can give light and life and stimulus. In the entrance examination apply two quite different tests—one to determine how much the pupil has profited by his enjoyment of literature and how much literary history he has learned; the other to determine how clearly he can express himself on some subject in which he is undeniably interested and on which he is sure to have some definite information to impart. Above all, seek to invent a method of examination which will make unprofitable and ridiculous a process of coaching and cramming in the senior year. Let us assume, once for all, that candidates will, must, and shou^{ld} appear ignorant of much that they have read, digested, and assimilated in the earlier years of the secondary course.

In the second place, let us try to imagine boys and girls as they actually are, not as they pedagogically ought to be. One would gather from the terms in which entrance requirements are often phrased that the graduates of preparatory schools are candidates for the doctor's degree. They are expected to be ripe scholars, exact observers, skilled logicians, cultured critics, and masters of the English language in all particulars.

I have phrased such requirements myself, and I therefore have no hesitation in saying that the expectation of such results from the years of secondary schooling is the impossible dream of pedants.

Not one in one hundred thousand, not one in a million, of those who are entitled to begin their university career, could meet these exacting conditions.

However we may phrase our entrance requirements, let us face the actual conditions. The real boy at the conclusion of his preparatory course is, and in most cases of a right ought to be, a comparatively unformed, wayward, impulsive young savage. He is a divine savage, to be sure, often full of fine impulses, and always, let us hope, worth the labor which it will cost to educate him. But he is without mature judgment, without settled purpose, without exact knowledge, in many cases with a memory that is marbled to receive and wax to retain. To expect him to be otherwise is to expect a miracle. If for the brief, spasmodic period of the entrance examination he presents a semblance of maturity in mind or character, the appearance, in all but the rarest exceptions, is illusory. It is a fragile vestment which will presently crackle and fall away from him like a coating of paraffine. In his English, at any rate, let us take him as he really is; let us see if we cannot in this delectable study, whose very essence is sincerity and candor, do away with all pretense, affectation, and artificiality. It will be better for the teacher, and it will be infinitely better for the pupil.

I have recently been reading over again the reports of the Harvard Committee on English Composition, in which a number of examination papers are reproduced in facsimile, and the distorted English of the writers is almost indecently exposed. Upon this same English there is much sarcastic comment in the committee's report, and the exhibits seem to justify it; but for my part I could not view these reelings and writhings of the adolescent mind without a feeling of pity. It was all so unreal. Back of this mess and confusion were genuine individuals with likes and dislikes, with budding ambitions, with tingling senses, with impulses toward right and wrong. Where did these individuals come in when judgment was passed upon their faulty English? What were they trying to do? What motives lay behind these queer antics of the pen? If only one could tear away the swathings, set the imprisoned spirits free, and interrogate them, a strange new light might be thrown upon the causes of bad English.

Another thought occurred to me as I read the reports. Should we not—at least those of us who are pragmatic philosophers—apply to the young offenders the crucial test of pragmatism? Where are

they now, the writers of these rejected addresses? Are they in jail? Are they social outcasts? Are they editing yellow journals, or in other ways defiling the well of English? Or are they eloquent preachers, successful lawyers, persuasive insurance agents, leaders of society? I do not wish to pursue inquiries which may overturn the pedagogical foundations, but I am frankly curious to learn how far the actual course of events will bear out judgments based upon such evidence.

In the third place, the entrance requirements should throw the emphasis upon the things which are of most importance. It is of course necessary that our young people should spell and punctuate properly, should make the verb agree with its subject, should use words in their dictionary senses and write sentences that can be read aloud without causing unnecessary pain to the mandibles. They should also know the meanings of the words in the poetry and prose that they read, and understand the allusions to things ancient and modern. But these matters, after all, are subsidiary and must be treated as such. They are means to an end. To treat them as an end in and for themselves is to turn education in this subject upside down. The main purpose of training in composition is free speech, direct and sincere communion with our fellows, that swift and untrammelled exchange of opinion, feeling, and experience, which is the working instrument of the social instinct and the motive power of civilization. The teacher of composition who does not somehow make his pupils realize this and feel that all of the verbal machinery is but for the purpose of fulfilling this great end, is false to his trust.

Again, the end of reading is, I take it, the widening of the mental, emotional, and imaginative horizon through contact with the creations of great literary artists. The sudden happy glow of emotion, the unbidden tear, the quick kindling of the young fancy, the awakening to the loveliness of nature, the refining and purging of the senses, the conviction of the validity of great principles of conduct, the realization of the inevitable tragedy of life—these are the priceless rewards of the appreciative reading of great literature. Whatever else is taught in the classes in literature, is subsidiary to these ends. To allow other considerations to get in their way, to obscure them, to take their place, is—I say it reverently—to commit a sin against the Holy Ghost.

I would not have the small things in secondary English overlooked or despised, but I would not on the other hand have them

magnified into great things. And if it were necessary to choose between the two—which fortunately it is not—I would myself much prefer the blundering writer hungry for communion with his fellows, or the blundering reader full of callow enthusiasms for Dickens and Longfellow, to the facile cynic or the cock-sure criticaster.

Perhaps I can condense all that I have been trying to say into the assertion that what the West wants in preparatory English is sympathetic, broad-minded, well-trained teachers. If such teachers can be secured, we are willing to trust them implicitly. We desire to co-operate with them and to give them all possible help and encouragement, we wish to know what they are doing, and we expect them to know what we are doing, and what are our needs and ideals. But we do not wish to hamper them by petty dictation or impose upon them conditions which will interfere with the development of their individual methods of instruction. We will leave to them the working-out of the details of the curriculum. We will judge them by the characters of the boys and girls whom they send to us. Give us good teachers, and good students will follow as the night the day.

"MAKE-BELIEVE GRAMMAR" *

GERTRUDE BUCK

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Richard Grant White's statement that "nearly all of our so-called English grammar is mere make-believe grammar"¹ has recently been quoted with approval by Professor Tolman, of the University of Chicago, in his interesting account of "The Revival of English Grammar."² By "make-believe grammar" both writers mean, as Professor Tolman states, the application of rules modeled upon those of the highly inflected Latin language to the facts of the English tongue, which is almost wholly uninflected. As conspicuous examples of such unwarranted borrowings from Latin grammar are cited the objective case of nouns and the agreement of finite verbs with their subjects. In both these instances we have in English no modification of form to correspond with the Latin nomenclature; yet the nomenclature persists, with the necessary result that insensibly the pupil comes to regard the English tongue as falling short at many points of the accepted standard. Any well regulated language will, it is assumed, modify the form of a noun when it serves as direct object of a verb and that of a finite verb to agree with its subject in person and number. Since English does neither of these things, so much the worse for English. And from such entirely reasonable inferences the pupil cannot but derive an essentially false conception of his mother-tongue, a conception undefined, unacknowledged, but no less real and permanent, that the English language is a kind of inferior or degenerate Latin.

This species of "make-believe grammar," however, is pretty generally recognized and need not detain us long. Professor Barbour in his admirable "History of English Grammar Teach-

* Read before the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club, Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 2, 1908.

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, p. 304.

² *School Review*, February, 1902.

ing"³ has indicated its source in the Latinistic conceptions of English held by our earliest grammarians and has traced at least the beginnings of its decline under the influence of the wider linguistic knowledge of their successors. Professor Tolman cites Jespersen's *Progress in Language, with Especial Reference to English*, as competent authority for regarding the relatively uninflected English tongue as a stage, not in the deterioration or decay, but in the progressive evolution of language-structure. We are all theoretically at one upon this matter, it would seem, and though some details of reform demanded by the protestants may not be at once yielded by the practical teacher of grammar, the direction of our advance lies clear before us. English grammar must be presented as the formulated laws of *English* speech.

This essentially scientific attitude toward the facts of the English language is already exemplified to a marked degree in our modern treatment of questions of usage. Professors Brander Matthews and G. R. Carpenter, of Columbia University, Professor Scott, of the University of Michigan, and Professor Lounsbury, of Yale, have taught us that the old fashioned dogmatism of grammarians as to how people "ought" to speak is too commonly based on ignorance of the idiomatic peculiarities of our own language, of the past history of certain forms, or of present customs of speech outside a very limited circle. The more a man knows about any language the more clearly he sees it as a living, growing, changing thing; and the less willing is he to impose upon it an arbitrary legislation drawn from the usages of other tongues, from past usages of its own, or even from present usages not widely representative.

Both theoretically then, and in at least one notable point of practice, "make-believe grammar" of the type so far discussed in this paper has fallen into disrepute. There seems little room for doubt that it will eventually, and at no remote period, be superseded in every detail by a grammar which bases itself unequivocally upon the facts of the English tongue as English.

But the term "make-believe grammar" need not be confined to this fictitious structure of laws, terms, and definitions built

³ *Educational Review*, December, 1896.

up by analogy from another language and without firm foundation in the facts of English speech. There is another species, no less figmentary than this, and in my judgment far more fundamentally misleading to the pupil; that grammar, I mean, which is derived not only from speech that is not English, but from speech that is not, in any genuine sense, speech at all. Our early grammarians, we allege, turned away their eyes from the facts of English speech and gave us rules drawn by analogy from the usages of the Latin tongue. But have not grammarians of all languages and all times, too frequently turned away their eyes from the facts of speech itself, from the language process as we understand it today, and given us laws from the dead and detached product of that process? If this be true, we have a fictitious construction in English grammar considerably more important as it is both deeper-lying and farther-reaching than the mere Latinizing of English.

Is it, however, true? Almost infallibly one is assured upon the first page of every textbook on English grammar that "language is a means of communication." And from this indubitable, though somewhat shadowy declaration, we should naturally expect to proceed by observing certain cases in which an idea is conveyed from one mind to another and analyzing the process as reflected in the language used. The office of various elements involved in this communication would then presumably be noted, and the elements defined on this basis. That is, one would analyze a sentence as the unit of language, to discover the parts of speech. But instead of this the accredited procedure up to a very recent date, both for textbook and for teacher, has been first to define the parts of speech in turn and then proceed to join certain of them together in such fashion as to make what was called a sentence. A noun, that is a word, representing a person or thing was prefixed to a verb, that is, a word standing for an action or a state of being, and behold a sentence! Thirty years ago pupils were not infrequently required to manufacture sentences after this method, of which a *reductio ad absurdum* appears in the following "direction"

taken from Reed and Kellogg's *Higher Lessons in English*.⁴ "Unite the words in columns 2 and 3 below [auxillaries appear in column 2, past participles in column 3] and append the verbs thus formed to the nouns and pronouns in column 1 so as to make good sentences." And the implication that this is the typical sentence-structure, that language is a mechanical aggregation of separate elements, appears continually in the definitions and rules current during this period. In his *Essentials of English Grammar*,⁵ Whitney assures us that the parts of speech must be "joined" together, "in order to make a whole, in order to be speech." "For a sentence," he declares further, "there must be not only words of more than one kind, but words of certain kinds, *fitted together in certain ways*." (The italics are, of course, mine.) Nor can we "make a complete sentence without *joining together* a subject and a predicate."

There could be no more unequivocal statement of the conception of language as a mechanical aggregation of separate words. And I might quote interminably from Whitney's contemporaries, even, I regret to say, from some modern textbooks also, equally direct implications of this conception.

It is doubtless true that to the grammarian of an older generation there was no apparent inconsistency between this *e pluribus unum* conception of sentence-structure and the statement that language communicates the speaker's thought, since to the crude psychology which he had inherited from a still earlier time thought itself was "a thing of shreds and patches." One was, indeed, supposed to think first "house" and then "burning" and then put these two thoughts together before he could think—or say—"the house is burning." Granting this as a true account of the structure of thought, language might with entire consistency be described as a similar adding of word to word.

But we all know now, that whatever else this splicing of "percept" to "concept" may be, it is not in the genuine sense of the term "thought," any more than a leaf, a stem and a root tied together are a plant. The leaf, the stem and the root are

⁴ Lesson 11.

⁵ Chap. ii.

found in the plant as the ideas of house and burning are found in the thought that the house is on fire; but as the plant is a living growth, which has put out root, stem, and leaf, so the thought is an organic structure out of which its constituent ideas have developed. From a confused sense of something wrong perhaps as one suddenly wakes out of sleep, grows the single thought of the whole situation, namely, the house's being on fire, in which neither the house as such nor the act of burning as such have any separate existence. The thought is, in truth, one before it is many. The growing plant or animal is its fair analogy, not the mosaic or the stone wall.

This organic conception of thought the present generation of English grammar teachers have gained from psychology and from real logic. And further, all that we know of the structure of language from modern philologists and students of literature goes to show that it, too, is a living, growing thing, not in any sentimental or remotely analogical sense, but as sober, scientific fact. The sentence which is spliced together out of the "parts of speech" is, in truth, no sentence at all. It is not language any more than a company drill is fighting, or a scarecrow a man. Thought which is living, growing, organic in structure, cannot be conveyed or represented by a lifeless, static, artificial construction. Nor are we studying language by studying such a construction. The sentences which grammar presents to us have in very truth ceased to be language, once they have been cut off from all reference to the various acts of thought-communication which gave rise to them, so that they seem to exist in and for themselves, mere mechanical congeries of words, brought together only to fulfil certain arbitrary requirements of the sentence form as such.

That an artificial conception of the sentence similar to this, and directly at variance with our best knowledge of its nature and structure at the present time, has conditioned much teaching of English grammar in the past, seems to be indubitable. And that this false conception has actually been conveyed to pupils through their study of English grammar I also believe. A

priori we should, indeed, expect it to be so. The mind of the child is extraordinarily sensitive to the images latent in our phrases. Professor Scott's paper on the "Figurative Element in Grammatical Terminology"⁶ discloses some quite unforeseen conclusions drawn by the young pupil from the uses in grammar of such supposably abstract and wholly technical terms as "case," "agree," "govern," "decline." And it is hardly conceivable that he should be insensitive to the suggestions of mechanical aggregation offered by such words as "joined with," "fitted together," "added to," "put with," "put together with," or "put along with," which in the older textbook are continually applied to the relations of words with one another in the sentence.

The expectation, moreover, that images of sentence-structure, as mechanical rather than organic, must inevitably be carried by language of this sort, has been abundantly confirmed by such data upon the subject as I have been able to gather for myself. From time to time during the past few years I have taken occasion to inquire into the ideas of language-structure and function actually carried away by children from their study of English grammar. Students in both high school and college have written for me at various times answers to the following questions: "What image (or picture) stood for the sentence in your mind after you had first studied grammar in school? What did you then think a sentence was for?" Though many pupils were of course conscious of no definite image, and many saw the sentence always in terms of the formal diagram they had been taught to use, the remaining answers all but invariably indicated both an artificial conception of sentence structure and a complete dissociation of the sentence from any purpose other than that of serving as a grammatical exercise. The picture suggested might be a string of beads, a line of wooden blocks, a train of cars, a card-house, a square of crazy patchwork; but it was almost invariably a whole made up of separate things put together in a certain way. And these things were put together, not in order to express an idea to someone else, but simply to—why, to make

⁶ *Leaflet No. 36*, published by the New England Association of Teachers of English.

a sentence! "It was built up by somebody," says one student, "just as a block house might have been—for no purpose but to pull it down again." "I never thought a sentence was for anything but to study," sadly remarks another; while a third volunteers the admission that, though "a sentence in grammar" seemed to her as a child, like a square of patchwork, she does not think of "a real sentence" in this way—"one that comes in my reading, I mean." This pointed distinction between "a real sentence" and "a sentence in grammar," has been repeatedly implied in the statements of different pupils, and seems to me worthy of serious consideration.

Such inquiries as this are no doubt relatively unimpressive to anyone who receives them at second hand; but I believe that any teacher who, without prejudice, undertakes a similar line of investigation for himself, will come upon some astonishing and not insignificant revelations as to the vestigia left in the child's mind from his study of English grammar. Most convincing of all, to me, upon this point, however, are the unconscious betrayals to the teacher of literature or composition of a pupil's unrecognized sense of language as dissociated from the living thought process, an artificial structure of mere words for no end save that of meeting a requirement or "showing off" one's skill. Sometimes in such cases the source of this idea of language seems to lie back of any larger study of writing or literature in some obscure but persistent image, finally traced to the pages of the grammar textbook or to the lips of the grammar teacher, an image of the sentence as a "made-up" thing, consisting of words put together to form a certain pattern or to exemplify a given rule. Such a deep-lying, inwoven conception, as many of us know, goes not out by prayer or fasting. Only the expulsive power of a new and truer image will avail; and upon the task of making an entrance for such an image into the preoccupied mind, presenting it again and again, etching it deeper and deeper over the lines of the old picture—upon this task, sometimes seemingly hopeless, many teachers of composition and literature are today expending their best efforts. No real writing, no real

reading can be done by the student until works become to him direct and genuine expressions of thought. But surely all this labor to restore a vital significance which need never have been lost, is an indefensible waste in education.

It is only fair to say, however, that year by year such cases as this become fewer, in my own experience at least. And they would reach the vanishing-point within a college generation or so, if only our growing sense of the fatuity of teaching a pupil in English grammar ideas of language which must be with infinite difficulty unlearned when he studies composition and literature could be reinforced by an unerring choice of means for imparting to him the truer and more permanent conception of language as organic. This last is, indeed, the crux of the practical situation. Since the reign of W. D. Whitney and of Reed and Kellogg in the field of English grammar we have unquestionably advanced several steps in the direction of teaching the actual structure of language; but the tale is not yet fully told. Many of our recent textbooks strive, with varying success, to keep the "real sentence" and the sentence of grammar from invidious separation in the pupil's mind. They forbear to require the manufacture of imitation sentences, according to a formula furnished by them. Instead of "building" sentences to order after this fashion, they rather study such sentences as grow naturally out of the student's own thought or such as easily communicate to him the thought of another person, and hence become vicariously his own. These sentences are not mere puzzles, combinations of words in a certain pattern. They exist to convey thought, and do convey it to the pupil, since it is thought of a type which either is already or readily may become his. And at least the vanguard of our grammar teachers at the present time see that whether the pupil himself actually makes the sentence or whether it is suggested to him, he does not study its structure until it is to him a living sentence, a real expression of thought.

The modern textbook and the modern teacher, moreover, insist upon studying the parts of speech as derived from the sentence, not the sentence as made up from the parts of speech.

They attempt, at least, to define each part of speech by the actual service it renders in conveying the thought of the sentence as a whole, rather than as merely representing some particular class of things in the world. This is a little fire, but it kindles a great matter. Verbs do, no doubt, in the realm of words, roughly correspond to actions or "states of being" in the world of things, nouns to persons or things, adjectives to the qualities of persons or things, prepositions to relations between persons and things, and so on. But to define a verb, a noun, an adjective, and a preposition in this way is certainly to give color to the mechanical conception of sentence-structure. Join a person or thing to an action, a quality to the person or thing, a relation to another thing, and the two to the action, and you have a thought. In the same fashion unite a noun with a verb, an adjective with the noun, a preposition with another noun, and the two with the verb, and behold the language-structure corresponding to the thought. Such is the implication of these definitions. If, however, the subject as a whole has been first distinguished from the predicate as a whole, on the basis of the different function each performs in conveying the thought of the whole sentence, if then each part of speech is similarly discriminated from every other on the basis of its office in developing further any element of the thought, the adjective, for instance, being defined by virtue of its function as particularizing in various ways the meaning of a noun or pronoun, an adverb as discriminating the precise manner or conditions of the action indicated by the verb—if, in short, a vivid sense of the *activity* of the whole sentence and of all its parts in the communication of thought underlies every definition and rule, we have at least an honest effort to deal with real language and to represent it as it is.

Attempts of this sort are certain to be faulty in detail until we have become more completely interpenetrated than any of us can be as yet with the functional conception of the sentence. But they serve at least to point the way of our advance in the rational and scientific teaching of English grammar.

We know that the study of English grammar has long since

ceased to justify itself as a practical art. It has been pretty thoroughly demonstrated in experience that by parsing words and memorizing rules children do not learn to speak and write correctly. There remains, then, to the subject, only such justification as it may fairly claim on grounds of being a science, the theoretic formulation of the laws of the English language within the limits of the sentence-form. But this justification is surely imperiled by the charge of unscientific method and conclusion brought against it by students of comparative philology, in their contention that English grammar treats and represents the English language not as English but as a hybrid or deteriorated Latin. And still more conclusively we must admit does English grammar forfeit its justification to a place in the curriculum of studies as the science or theory of the English sentence, if it continues to treat its subject-matter in a fashion essentially unscientific, averting the eyes from the facts of genuine speech and writing, to analyze instead a fictitious construction of its own; if it studies and presents to pupils, in lieu of the living language, an artificial substitute manufactured by the grammarian and without real existence or usefulness in the world; if it holds and conveys to students false conceptions of the English language not only as English but also as language itself. This is "make-believe grammar" in its deadliest aspect. Until we have done with it entirely we cannot begin to enter into the possibilities which real grammar offers to education in these present days.

A word only in conclusion as to these possibilities. If we pass in review the great tendencies and achievements in education for the past half-century, we may note one principle as common to them all—the principle, namely, of displacing a formula by an activity, second-hand by first-hand knowledge. The laboratory method in natural science thus substitutes the pupil's own drawing of inferences and formulation of laws for his acceptance of them ready-made as the products of other people's observations and induction. He sees, traces out, controls, and analyzes the processes giving rise to the formulæ which once he merely memorized from the pages of a book. And

wherever the experimental method has obtained, even in subjects once regarded as insusceptible of scientific treatment, such as psychology and history, the observation of activities has supplanted the mere learning of the results of these activities.

In manual training we have a further instance of the transmutation of dead fact into living action. Those facts and principles of measurement, calculation, physical properties, which were once given directly to the student as rules or formulae to be learned, are now encountered by him as he follows step by step some active process in which they are involved. He thus grasps them more readily and retains them more easily, since they represent to him the living conditions or results of an activity which he has himself witnessed or carried on.

Of similar significance is that interesting type of primary education which uses the primitive industrial processes, such as pottery making, weaving, iron and metal work, not only to train the eye, the hand, and the mind of the pupil, but to afford him some insight into the complex social organization of which he is a part. By following out these processes from their crude beginnings to their complicated development in the present industrial order, the child is believed to gain not only a vital and thorough knowledge of the facts and principles incident to them throughout their evolution, but also some comprehension of those infinitely tangled and multitudinous activities which constitute the world's life, but which to those of us not thus initiated are usually little more than a "big blooming buzzing Confusion."

With the relative values of these various educational movements we are not now concerned. Our interest is wholly in the coincidence of their animating ideas, a coincidence which can hardly be regarded as purely accidental. Beneath innumerable differences of superficial aspect, these three noteworthy tendencies in modern education are rooted in the same elementary principle, namely that the products or results of an active process can be rightly understood and strongly seized upon by the human mind only in connection with that process.

Within the field of language-study, moreover, this principle

has to some extent already obtained. The historical and the comparative study of languages and literature is in fact built upon it. Our teaching of English composition has for several years paid tribute to it. In English grammar, last of all, we are beginning to recognize it. In this subject, therefore, we have yet to receive the returns which its completer acceptance and more consistent carrying out have elsewhere yielded.

These returns are so far conceded that I need only enumerate them. The laboratory method, manual training, the study of social and industrial activities, the organic or functional study of languages, of literature, of English composition, restore to dead forms, detached facts, meaningless laws, the color, the life, the significance which they have lost through separation from the activities which gave them birth. Such restoration will assuredly take place in grammar—has indeed already taken place wherever the organic conception of language has entered into it.

When we have at length dismissed entirely from our teaching that artificial product of the grammarian's ingenuity which I cannot forbear characterizing as "near-language," and set our pupils in earnest to studying the language process by direct analysis of the sentence-activity, we shall find this subject richer in its opportunities than any of us has conceived. In the first place the language process is not, like weaving or pottery making, obsolete in our modern households. It is at hand whenever and wherever one wants it. It is carried on by every child without self-consciousness as an essential activity in his daily life. It may be studied without elaborate apparatus of any kind. Since it involves abstract relations, without that actual manipulation of material substance characteristic of the industrial processes, it should doubtless not be the earliest activity studied by the child; but we must not on the other hand forget that when every language relation is consistently referred to the concrete reality behind the words, intelligent dealing with it becomes comparatively easy even for pupils in the lower grades.

But beyond its extraordinary availability, the language process has a second and quite incommensurable advantage over any

other process as a subject for study, in its unrivaled importance to the social order. If it is held advisable that the young student should understand certain industrial processes, that he may thereby gain some insight into this complicated modern world of ours, he should assuredly to this same end apply himself to that great process of communication by language between man and man, through which alone the individual can put his knowledge and thought at the service of his fellows, through which alone society can profit by the achievements of its members.

It is with this act, rightly understood, that grammar has to deal, not with mere words printed on the page. And in so far as it studies this act at first hand, observing and analyzing it as communication, as the living transference of thought from mind to mind, creating thus and shaping to its ends the sentence form—in so far may it be accounted real grammar.

BETTER THINGS IN SECONDARY SCHOOL ATHLETICS

FRANK B. WADE
Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, Ind.

By vote of the Board of School Commissioners of the city of Indianapolis, all participation in interscholastic athletics, with the exception of the state track meet, was forbidden the high schools of the city after the close of the football season of 1907. This action was taken with the understanding that a system of intraschool athletics should be substituted, and was really the outcome of the gradual growth of a very strong sentiment among some of the teachers of the two high schools, who had had most to do with managing athletics, that the then existing condition in athletics, which was similar to that in most high schools of the country, was not worthy of continuance.

There was no revolution in the athletic situation. There was rather a gradual evolution. For several years prior to the change, eligibility requirements had been increased and more strictly enforced and athletics had gradually come to be viewed in more nearly correct perspective and estimated by saner standards.

It was thus possible for our school board to issue the order already referred to, and possible for the faculties of the high schools to bring about the change with a minimum of friction. Not that there was no opposition to the new order of things. That was to be expected. The boys who had been brought up under the old standards found it hard to believe that any good could come of a change which deprived them of the excitement and glory of "licking" this or that institution in football or baseball. It must even be admitted that some teachers were skeptical concerning the new methods in athletics, and unfriendly to them.

Soon after the new order went into effect, the author of the present article read a paper before the Indiana State Teachers' Association, in which many reasons for the change were given.

This paper was in reality an explanation and a defense of the new system, and at that time a defense was needed, as many of the teachers of the state were so thoroughly impregnated with the infection of the old type of athletics that they were either hostile to the new scheme, or skeptical as to the possibility of its success. As the paper in question will, perhaps, explain the situation at the time of the change, better than one written at the present time could do, I will include it in this article. It is as follows:

Mr. President, and Fellow-Teachers of Indiana:

I have been asked to speak to you about the abolition of interscholastic contests in the Indianapolis schools. I have long been interested in the matter of improving existing conditions in athletics and welcomed the action of our school board in prohibiting interschool games in the future. As a boy I grew up in a locality where I got all the healthful exercise I needed without much help from athletics, as we use the term to denote certain forms of competitive games. I happened to live near the salt water and so had endless opportunities for rowing and sailing, boat-building, fishing and shooting, swimming and skating. Then to the north of my home was a forest of pine and cedar reaching to Plymouth, Massachusetts, a distance of nearly forty miles. Although the first part of New England to be settled, this section still contains one of the largest tracts of wooded country, in a single piece, on the Atlantic coast from Maine to Mexico. Wild deer still roam in these woods and many smaller forms of game are to be found. So I had plenty of healthy exercise, such as tramping, hunting, and camping in the woods, when tired of the salt water sports. Such opportunities are not present to such a degree in large inland cities, and I realize that in most cases the boys must work off their surplus energies in other ways.

Athletic games afford a substitute, and, when properly viewed and used, a worthy substitute, for field and water sports. I do not take the ground that football, baseball, etc., are essentially harmful or dangerous. Aside from the danger of overstrain, I think that football is no more dangerous than boating, shooting, swimming, or skating, and I would certainly advise every boy to do all of these things if possible in spite of the risk in them all.

I was never heavy enough to make a football team, but I remember playing one game at college which taught me much about the risks of the game. It was during the Thanksgiving recess and the boys who lived too far away to go home planned a game between upper classmen and underclassmen. For lack of any better material I was put in at right tackle for the upper classmen. It happened that the "varsity" back field that year were mainly under classmen and also men who lived at a distance, so I got a chance to see how they did things. Picking me as the easiest point in our line, the opposing quarterback ran play after play at me. I soon learned how to dive

in, grab all the legs I could conveniently reach, and thus pile up the interference on top of myself while our backs stopped the man with the ball. The interesting part is that I didn't get hurt any, although that same back field had played a very creditable game against Yale that season. I think that the friends of the game are right when they claim that its dangers have been overrated.

What I am principally opposed to is the false estimate now placed upon athletic sports and the failure of such sports to reach any large part of the boys. I would like to outline briefly to you some of the ways in which athletics, as at present almost universally conducted, fail in these respects, and, to set the matter before you in an orderly fashion, I will follow a little brief which I have prepared.

I will consider the defects of the present system from three viewpoints: first, from the pedagogical; second, from the physical; third, from an ethical point of view.

Under the first head, the pedagogical view, it may be said, I think, that the value of athletics as at present in vogue is disproportionate to the cost in time of players and of teachers who supervise the game. The school work of the player himself suffers because of the amount of time and energy spent on the field. Such an amount would hardly be spent for exercise if it were not regarded as very necessary to win. As to the time required of the teacher in charge, many of you can testify that it has at times been a severe burden, and that your larger work has suffered because of the extra demand upon you. Some of you can doubtless testify also that the financial management of football and other teams is no light burden. Moreover, aside from the effects upon those teachers and pupils directly connected with the games, the tension developed among the students in general, before a decisive game, results in inefficiency in studies. It is needless to dwell upon this point before a body of teachers.

From the physical side, it may be advanced that, owing to careless habits of training, many high-school boys do not properly prepare themselves for some of the more strenuous forms of athletic games, and overstrain may result. With athletics under control of a strictly capable man, preferably one who is a graduate physician, such results might be largely eliminated, but, as at present conducted, I suspect that more boys are overstrained than is generally known.

A second and more serious objection to present-day methods is that far too few of the boys are engaged in sports and games, while a small number of boys of a type who least need encouragement to exercise their bodies get an excessive share of such exercise. This is really the most valid argument, in my opinion, against the athletics of the day. Too few take part. The few who do, devote too much time and energy to it.

Now for a brief account of the actual working of the new scheme. As my experience has been confined to the Shortridge High School, I shall report only facts observed in connection with the athletics of that school. In the main, however, I should say that the benefits described would apply to both our high schools.

Our first new athletic work began January 1, 1908. A fencing-class of about thirty boys was organized by one of our men teachers. More boys applied than could well be handled. This class continued for three months and closed its season April 1. While a number of boys dropped out, as was to be expected where hard physical exercise and close attention to form was so necessary, a very respectable squad continued the work, and a tournament, with preliminaries, second round, semi-finals, consolations, and a final bout, lent all the excitement and interest to the course that was healthy. The final bout was held on the platform of the auditorium before the entire school, some 1,200 pupils being present. This bout was preceded by a drill of the entire squad without command, and very great interest was manifested by the pupils in the whole affair. Yet there were none of the bad effects which used to attach to interscholastic contests. The discipline and scholarship of the school, as a whole, did not suffer, and the scholarship of those who took part was not harmed by the two afternoons a week devoted to the sport.

Soon after the fencing work began, indoor track work and indoor tennis were started, each under the charge of a faculty man competent in those sports. Two very interesting indoor track meets have already been held, with the keenest sort of interest and competition on the part of those entered in the events. Over forty boys have had the benefits of the two afternoons a week of track practice, and some thirty boys and girls have been engaged in tennis. In addition to these, somewhat over eighty boys are now engaged in baseball practice twice a week, in four squads, under the management of four of our faculty men. A regular schedule of games has been arranged, and the baseball will be conducted after the manner of a four-team league. The division into squads was accomplished in the following manner, in order to prevent

the continuance of rivalry over to another year. Each manager chose a boy known to be a crack ball-player to act as his captain. Then, at a mass meeting of the seventy or more boys who wished to play, the captains drew lots for number of choice, and each in turn chose one boy until all were chosen. Each squad then chose a color by which it will be known for the season. In this way there can be no interclass bitterness, and, in addition, the teams will be much more evenly matched, and no team of young and small boys will be compelled to meet a team of older and larger boys. The baseball schedule is so arranged as not to conflict with the state track meet, which we still enter. In fact, there will be a recess of a couple of weeks in the baseball season, so that boys who happen to be on both baseball and track teams need not find their athletic work excessive or conflicting.

The continuance of the schools in interscholastic track work was permitted in recognition of the fact that in track work many of the evils which belong to football and to some other games are absent. There is no bodily contact of contestants, and that of itself makes track work less subject to what is called in football, "dirty play."

We have not yet worked out our method of handling football in intraschool athletics. Perhaps we shall find that we can get along without it.

We have, I think, shown that with a fair amount of intelligent co-operation on the part of faculty and students, many more boys can have the benefits of athletic games than under the old system, and fewer boys derive harm from athletics. We had, on April 1, over one hundred and forty boys actively engaged in athletics of some sort, whereas during the entire last year only fifty-one boys were certified as eligible, and not all those played in games. In discharging one of my duties in connection with athletics, namely, the recording of report cards of the boys who wish to become eligible—for we still require fifteen hours per week of passing grades before a boy can take part in athletics—I find a great improvement in the average scholarship of the athlete under the new system. A number of the boys have remarked, in handing me a report card, "That's the best report I ever got." So thoroughly

is the new scheme succeeding that many of the boys who at first opposed it have frankly admitted that they were mistaken, and these boys are now warm believers in it. If the proper amount of energy is given to the work, it will not be long before the pupils will regard it as a "time-honored institution" of our school system and will be its staunch defenders.

It seems to me that this new order of things is sufficiently worth while to merit wider experiment on the part of school authorities; and it is in the hope that this article may stimulate such experiment that I have reported the preliminary progress that we, in Indianapolis, believe we have made toward better things in secondary school athletics.

It may be interesting right here to give a few facts in regard to the number of boys who took part in athletics at Shortridge last year (1907). I happened to have charge of certifying to the eligibility of all players, both for interscholastic and interclass games, and kept a card-catalogue record of the matter. In all four branches of recognized athletic sports, football, basket-ball, baseball and track, fifty-one boys were certified to the principals of various schools. Not all those boys played in the games. That fifty-one includes all who went along as substitutes. We had, at Shortridge, during the year, about 500 boys. At the Manual Training High School they have many more boys than we have, but I doubt very much if any larger percentage actually took part in games.

As to the number of our boys who went out for practice but were never certified, they were not numerous. After the first team is picked, there is usually difficulty in keeping more than a full second team out at practice. The time of coach and captain is used to perfect a winning first team, and scant attention awaits any boy who has no prospects of making a star player. To give these other boys their share in the real benefits of athletic sports and games, we must first of all change our estimate of the absolute necessity of a winning first team. The instinct and desire to win is all right, but I think victory is obtained at too great cost when a large proportion of the boys are deprived of the benefits of the games conducted by the school, in order that the first team may win games.

To show you that under a system of intraschool games a much larger number of boys could derive benefits, I will cite the case of our interclass track meet held last spring (1907). There was plenty of interest, a keen desire to win was manifested, and more boys were certified for that meet than for all forms of interscholastic sport for the entire year. Yet there was very little disturbance of the regular school work in consequence, and

the conduct of the whole affair was entirely under our supervision and control.

This leads me to my third head—the ethical view of present-day athletics.

Where such things are not directly under the control of the school authorities, many evils creep in which could not do so were athletics confined to the boys of one school. Among them I may mention the spirit of warfare which attends too many of our sports. They have become contests rather than games. Bad feeling is too often evident, and, occasionally, where large numbers are concerned, the mob spirit is shown and boys do things which, under ordinary circumstances, they would not think of doing. At such times, too, the low type of rooter who always follows the games gets in his work, and the schools get a credit for rowdiness which they do not really deserve.

Apart from this directly bad side is another side as bad from the ethical point of view. Public and pupils estimate the value of educational institutions on the basis of athletic games won or lost. This is ridiculous, but it is so. The colleges all know it, and faculties wink at abuses in order to curry popular favor that their numbers may not diminish.

Another ethical evil is the hero worship accorded the successful athlete. He is lauded above his real merits, and the worthy student who is not an athlete, but who may some day be a far more useful member of the community, gets scant attention. This is perhaps all the better for the student, but I think you can point to cases where the athlete has suffered from over-prominence.

It will not be necessary to go more into detail before an audience composed of teachers who have been studying these matters. I feel that you will all agree that there are many evils attendant upon our present athletics.

Now just a word of constructive criticism after all this destructive work. How can we improve upon the present situation, and, while lessening the intensity, increase the extent of our athletics, so that more boys may be benefited and fewer boys injured by them?

I believe that where the number of boys in a school is several hundred or more, the plan now being undertaken in this city will furnish a solution for our difficulties. As I noted a few minutes ago, more boys came out for our interclass track meet last spring than for all other forms of sport together. Let us put as much time and effort into stimulating participation in such intraschool athletics as we now put upon managing interscholastic games, and I am sure far more boys would receive benefit and fewer would be harmed. This sort of athletics will not run itself, however. It must be under competent management and supervision. It properly calls for the services of a director of the gymnasium and of the outdoor sports and games played in connection with the school. He should be a graduate physician, if possible, and he should also be an athlete in the best sense. He should be a man capable of beating any boy in the school at any sport

or game, and he should have broad and sound ethical sense. Such a man could solve most of the serious problems of present-day athletics. You say he would cost as much as a regular teacher? Yes! he should receive more than the average teacher. But why should the citizens of any prosperous community object to having their own sons, and daughters, too, receive the benefits of thorough and systematic physical training and also the beneficial relaxation of athletic games? Such a director could more than save his salary to any community by saving its boys from "going to the dogs."

You have seen many a promising boy spoiled under our present system by getting a wrong idea as to what is really worth while. Let us begin a campaign of education in regard to this matter. If enough of us are really interested in bettering the situation we shall better it in time.

Meanwhile, what can we do to help things out while our citizens are getting ready to attend to the matter through their school boards?

I would suggest, first, that where numbers permit, interscholastic games cease and that all the faculty work to encourage intraschool athletics. Let any man who can fence or box, or play baseball or basketball, get together a squad of boys in his specialty, and, at regular times, but not too frequently, put them through some lively work. As an incentive, let the season close with a game or series of several games between class teams or between the two upper classes and the two lower ones. There will be all the competition that is good for the school shown in such games.

At first there may be opposition to the new order of things. That is to be expected. The boys are infected with the spirit of contest and the thirst for winning teams. But if the matter is put to them firmly and fairly the opposition of the boys will not last long, particularly if opportunity for sport is given to the large numbers of boys who got no chance under the old system.

Where numbers are too small to keep up interest within the school, much can be done to better the present situation by restricting the outside games to a reasonable number, played with schools of similar size and at not too great distance, and by continuing, both in letter and in spirit, to live up to the excellent eligibility rules of our state High School Athletic Association.

NOTE.—Since the above article was accepted for publication two athletic seasons have passed, the spring and the fall seasons of 1908. To show that the methods described have continued to prove successful I will add a brief statement of the numbers taking part in baseball and in "soccer" or association football.

When the call for candidates for baseball was issued in April, eighty-one boys responded. A four-team league was formed, each team being under the direction of a faculty manager, and a regular schedule was planned. Games were played on two days a week, all four teams playing

at the same time on two different diamonds at the same field. The schedule was carried out successfully with some very good ball playing on the part of the boys and the games were eagerly contested and in most cases close. At the close of the series a game was played between a picked nine from the two teams at the foot of the list, and a picked nine from the faculty, the boys winning by a score of 9-6.

There is every evidence that a repetition of this success in baseball is possible.

In the fall term, as the above article suggests, we found it unnecessary to play the ordinary kind of football, but introduced instead the association game, or soccer football, as it is sometimes called. We did this because we believed that more boys would play this game for the sake of the game itself than would play regular football for that reason. I think events proved the correctness of the assumption. At the call for candidates ninety-six boys were chosen and a four-team league organized under four faculty managers as in baseball. The boys were assigned to teams purely by choice of the four captains, each choosing one boy in turn until all were taken. The schedule has been successfully completed with much interest on the part of the boys engaged in the sport and very few injuries have resulted. At least fifty boys stayed at the game, which speaks for the interest the players took in it.

There was less interest in the game on the part of those not playing, than in regular football, which, I think, merely reflects the prevailing condition of mind in America regarding athletic contests. We hope to educate the non-athletic portion of the school until they either become reasonably athletic themselves or at least learn to take a wholesome and moderate interest in games and sports which are not purely gladiatorial in their tendencies.

THE FOURTEENTH MICHIGAN CLASSICAL CONFERENCE

FRANCIS W. KELSEY

The Fourteenth Michigan Classical Conference was held at the University of Michigan on April 1 and 2, in connection with the annual meeting of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club. We print here the programme with references to the place of publication of the papers that have appeared in print.

PROGRAMME

WEDNESDAY MORNING, APRIL 1

Presiding Officer: Professor Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan

1. The Roman Forum as Cicero Saw It¹

Professor Walter Dennison, University of Michigan

Published in the *Classical Journal*, Vol. III (1908), pp. 318-26.

2. *Quod and Quia*: A Differentiation

Mr. O. O. Norris, Michigan State Normal College

To be published.

3. Collateral Work with Greek and Latin¹

Miss Edith Emma Atkins, Lansing High School

Published in *Moderator-Topics*, April, 1908.

4. Discussion of Miss Atkins' Paper

Miss Gertrude F. Breed, Ann Arbor High School; Dr. F. O. Bates, Detroit Central High School; Professor J. H. Drake, University of Michigan

5. *Salissationes* (Plaut. *Pseud.* 107)

Professor Samuel Grant Oliphant, Olivet College

To be published in the *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XXX (1909).

6. The Biblical Manuscripts in the Freer Collection¹

Professor Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan

Published in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. XII (1908), pp. 49-55.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON

Joint Session of the Classical Conference and the Interdenominational Conference of Church and Guild Workers in State Universities.

Presiding Officer: President James B. Angell, University of Michigan

¹ Illustrated with the stereopticon.

Symposium on the Value of Humanistic, Particularly Classical, Studies as a Preparation for the Study of the Professions: Theology.¹

7. The Place of Latin and Greek in the Preparation for the Ministry

William Douglas Mackenzie, President of Hartford Theological Seminary

Published in the *School Review*, Vol. XVI (1908), pp. 370-83, and in *Supplement to University Bulletin* (University of Michigan), Vol. IX (1908), No. 20, pp. 1-16.

8. The Value to the Clergyman of Training in the Classics

Rev. A. J. Nock, St. Joseph's Church, Detroit

School Review, Vol. XVI, pp. 383-90, and *Supplement to University Bulletin*, pp. 16-23.

9. Short Cuts to the Ministry, with Especial Reference to the Elimination of Latin and Greek from Theological Education

Hugh Black, Union Theological Seminary, New York

School Review, Vol. XVI, pp. 533-37, and *Supplement to University Bulletin*, pp. 23-28.

10. Greek in the High School, and the Question of the Supply of Candidates for the Ministry

Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan

School Review, Vol. XVI, pp. 561-79, and *Supplement to University Bulletin*, pp. 28-46.

11. Concluding Remarks

President James B. Angell, Chairman, University of Michigan

Supplement to University Bulletin, p. 47.

WEDNESDAY EVENING

Presiding Officer: Professor Fred N. Scott, University of Michigan

12. Lecture before the Classical Conference and the Philological Association of the University of Michigan: The Roman Theater²

Professor Charles Knapp, Columbia University

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 2

Presiding Officer: Professor Joseph H. Drake, University of Michigan

13. A Visit to the Battlefields of Caesar in Gaul, 1899²

Principal George R. Swain, Bay City High School

¹ At the Classical Conference of 1909 there will be a symposium on "The Value of the Study of Latin and Greek as a Training for Men of Affairs."

A few copies of the *Supplement to University Bulletin*, Vol. IX, No. 20, are available and will be sent, as long as the supply lasts, to those who will forward their names and addresses (enclosing a two-cent stamp) to Mr. L. P. Jocelyn, Secretary, South Division Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

² Illustrated with the stereopticon.

14. A Proposed Visit to the Battlefields of Caesar in Gaul, 1908
Professor Walter Dennison, University of Michigan
Classical Journal, Vol. III, pp. 333, 334.
Professor Dennison and a small but enthusiastic party of Latin teachers visited a number of the battlefields the past summer.
15. Latin and the Doctrine of Least Resistance
Professor H. J. Barton, University of Illinois
16. Why We Admire Homer
Professor A. M. Wilcox, University of Kansas
Read by title.
17. a. Some Questions Relating to Manuscripts of Livy
To be published in *Classical Philology*.
b. The Roman Camp of Saalburg: Its Remains and Its Restoration¹
Professor F. W. Shipley, Washington University
18. On the Order of Words in Latin Prose
Professor Clarence L. Meader, University of Michigan
To be published in the *School Review*.

JOINT SESSION OF THE CLASSICAL AND MODERN LANGUAGE
CONFERENCES

FRIDAY EVENING, APRIL 3

Presiding Officer: Professor Max Winkler, University of Michigan

19. Address—Wit and Wisdom of Herodotus
Professor Maurice Hutton, University of Toronto

ADDENDUM

A part of the paper read by Professor J. R. Nelson of the Lewis Institute, Chicago, at the Classical Conference of 1907, appeared in the *School Review*, Vol. XVI, pp. 517-19, under the title "A Roman Dinner," and a part under the title "A Revival of the Megalensian Games" *ibid.*, pp. 660-63.

¹ Illustrated with the stereopticon.

THE ESSENTIAL VOCABULARY OF HIGH-SCHOOL LATIN—THE PRINCIPLE OF ITS SELECTION AND THE REFORM OF ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS

GEORGE H. BROWNE, A.M.

The Browne and Nichols School, Cambridge, Mass.

Every step in the changes in entrance requirements in Latin since Harvard, in 1886, adopted exclusively sight-translation requirements, has been a step backward in one respect at least: every step has, in one way or another, put us farther away from perfect freedom of choice, and consequently from much-desired uniformity. If the latest form of the present reform movement tends directly or indirectly to intenser or further prescription, in any form, I protest that it is not a step forward.

According to the Harvard requirements of 1886, English was the only language, ancient or modern, in which any portion of text to be read was prescribed—the examinations were all at sight. But uniformity was not attained, for no other college followed suit; the fitting schools proved inadequate to the sudden freedom allowed them, and Harvard “took back water” in a resort to prescription again in 1898. The advent of “The Board” a few years later did not relieve the situation which had to be faced by large schools preparing for many colleges—a situation now complicated by useless multiplication of varieties of prescription—“a situation which I will not miscall, which I dare not name; which I scarcely know how to comprehend in the terms of any description.”

To relieve this intolerable situation, resolutions have been passed by several important bodies petitioning for a return to sight examinations.* In presenting similar resolutions to the

*In the autumn of 1907 they were first presented to the Conference of Masters of Church Schools (Groton, St. Mark's, and St. Paul's) and to the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools; adopted by the Classical Association of New Hampshire, sympathized with by a resolution of the American Philological Association, December 28, 1907; and indorsed, March 24, 1908, by the Committee of the Conference of Masters of Church Schools.

Eastern Massachusetts Classical Association last February, I acted in good faith on behalf of the principle involved (for I am not personally a sufferer from lack of uniformity). We believed that the object was to secure a kind of examination which pre-eminently should *not* "in large measure, if not wholly, determine the way in which the work is carried on in the schools," but which, on the other hand, should tend to preserve individuality on the part of the school, and to increase the ability, on the part of the pupil, to read Latin—if not more in amount and variety, surely not less. The resolutions which I had the honor to present explicitly called for two things only: some agreement on uniform requirements, and the prescription of much smaller portions of literature—"testing the power to read the language by simple examinations at sight, and thus leaving to the schools the choice of the major part of the reading to be done by their students." The New England Classical Association, April 4, 1908, voted to invite the classical associations of the Middle States and Maryland, and of the Middle West and South, to join in their petition to the American Philological Association to formulate classical entrance requirements in accordance with the sympathetic resolution passed by it, December 28, 1907. Accordingly, on April 18, 1908, the Association of the Middle West and South favored "the general policy of seeking the establishment of uniformity of college-entrance requirements in the Classics expressed in identical terms;" but would not commit itself to details. All details, it very properly thought, should be left to a Commission, to be appointed by the American Philological Association, adequately representing all the various organizations of classical teachers. The Classical Association of the Middle States and Maryland, however, on April 25, 1908, took upon itself the specification of details by adopting, with but a single dissenting vote, a scheme of examination presented by Professor Charles Knapp, the distinguishing characteristic of which is the following:

In all sight-examinations, the meanings of Latin words in the passages set not contained in the select list of 2,000 Latin words, or of the English words in the passages set for translation into Latin not readily translatable by the Latin words in the select list of 2,000 Latin words, shall be given in footnotes on the examination paper.

The fortunes of a national movement for uniformity would thus seem to be involved in the selection of a list of 2,000 words, even before the general principle of uniformity has been officially approved by an authoritative body. I do not believe that any list at present available can bear such responsibility, or ought to. The movers of a truly liberal reform regret that it has been associated with any single book, however good—even so excellent a book as Professor Lodge's, *quem honoris causa nomino* on the authority of Professor Peck (*Educational Review*, April, 1908) and of Professor Knapp (*School Review*, October, 1908, and *Educational Review*, November, 1908), who identify the Middle States plan with the adoption of "a scheme of examinations which has as its corner stone (*sic*) the book by Professor Lodge, with its select list of 2,000 words." But "the head stone of the corner" may be a stone that the builders will refuse. Then, what becomes of our national structure of reform?

It is inconceivable that a Commission of the American Philological Association will attach to a national scheme for uniform examinations a fixed list of words, before the principle of selection of the most efficient vocabulary has been determined. The only two methods of selection yet seriously applied have produced lists of such different literary character, that a consideration of the principle of selection seems forced by the logic of the situation.

Of the total vocabulary of *B. G.* i-v, *Cic. Cat.* i-iv, *Arch.* and *Pomp.*, and *Aen.* i-vi, 4,650 words, Professor Lodge prints in display type 2,000 as most important. For brevity, let us call this the "prescribed" list. Professor Lodge's large flat page enables him to use some judgment of his own in his selection (and very properly, for of course a numerical test is not the only test of Latinity); and to group several related forms under one number. He has accordingly taken advantage of the large size and number of his pages to make his book a useful compendium of Latin usage,² of different meanings in different grammatical constructions,³ of the words commonly used with special words,⁴

²See *acies*, *adeo*, *aggredior*, etc.

³See *adhibeo*, *consulo*, *expecto*, *ludo*, etc.

⁴See *aestus*, *officio*, *cacicus*, *vulnus*, *vultus*, etc.

of special combinations,⁵ of contrasts,⁶ of *discernenda*,⁷ and of synonyms.⁸ His appendix, too, containing the complete vocabulary of 4,650 words arranged in the order of occurrence, may be of great service, if you happen to be reading those particular books in just that sequence; but it is of less service, if you don't; and of very doubtful service, if it *compels* either the sequence or the selection. The point I wish to make is that the use of a limited prescribed text as the basis of selection is likely to produce a vocabulary as inadequate to the responsibilities which the Middle States plan imposes upon it, as it is obviously insufficient to justify such summary statements of usage as this, under *vehemens*₆₁: "Caes. uses the adv. only, *vehementer*₁₂₇; Cic. only the adj. in various uses." The index-figures (which are mine) show that the usage in *all* of Caes. and Cic. tells a different story from the usage in the prescribed portions; and so it does in the selection of vocabulary, as an aid to Latin at sight.

The other method of selection is the strict application of an arbitrary number of times used to the *complete* works of Latin authors. For brevity, let us call the result the "open" list. The arrangement of this list in narrow parallel columns, one to a page, compels the numbering of every short line; consequently, every word, phrase, idiom, compound, or variant, recorded as occurring over 15 times in *all* of Cicero's orations, and over 5 times in *all* of Caesar, Sallust, Nepos, and *Aeneid* i-vi, is reckoned in the enumeration. The application of personal judgment⁹ is left to the individual user,—all the words being provided with index-figures which show the number of times each word is used,—at

⁵ See *emo*, *fors*, *iam*, *nox*, *tum*.

⁶ See *laevus*, *niger*, *recens*, etc.

⁷ See *gladius* and *ensis*; *domesticus*, *alienus*; *ignoro*, *ignosco*; *mens*, *animus*; *pecor*, *pecud*; *reddo*, *redeo*; *uro*, *ardeo*, etc.

⁸ See *amnis*, *interficio*, *mare*, *posco*, *protinus*, etc.

⁹ One may mistrust his judgment of the literary value of words from recollection, when he is reminded, for example, that the familiar idiom *in matrimonium dare* occurs only on the occasion of the marriage of Orgetorix' daughter; one may not be surprised that Caesar never uses *amo* and *amor*; but isn't it a surprise to learn that he doesn't use *canis*, *dea*, or *dens*, and uses *in fugam dare* but three times! Such familiar friends as *rus*₆, *rosa*₉, and *incola*₁₁ do not appear in *H. S. L.* prose; or *mensa* and *stella*, until we come to Vergil! The index figures do tell us where to put the emphasis.

the left by Caesar; at the right by Cicero. The "prescribed 2,000, thus, contains more, the "open" list fewer than the numbering shows.¹⁰ The 2,000 capital-words really include nearly 2,400 entries; the 3,240 entries of the open list may be grouped under 1,134 capital words. A comparison of the results of the application of these two methods, therefore, in the total number of resulting words is not conclusive. Let us briefly consider the comparative quality of the resulting words (indicated by the index-figures).

Of Professor Lodge's 2,000 capital words 101 are not in the open list (i. e., are not used 15 times in Cic. or 5 times in Caes., Sal., Nep., or *Aen.* i-vi); 19 occur in another form (practically the only form ever used); the remaining 82 are here given in the order of times used in all of Caesar (left) and in all of Cicero's orations (right). The figure on the line denotes the times used in *Aen.* i-vi:

14 t., *inlustrō*₁₄ 0 (7 t. in *High School Latin*), *olegō*₁₄ 0 (2 t. in *H. S. L.*), *militia*₁₄ 0 (not before *B. G.* vi; only 2 t. in *Pomp.*), *mitis*₁₄ 0 (2 t. in *H. S. L.*, *Cat.* iv).—13 t., *fortunatus*₁₃ 2, *narro*₁₃ 2, *porticus*₁₃ 1.—12 t., *olenio*₁₂ 4, *purus*₁₂ 4, *usquam*₁₂ 4.—10 t., *coetus*₁₀ 4, *fraternus*₁₀ 3, *excido*₁₀ 4, *rideo*₁₀ 4, *tempero*₁₀ 3.—9 t., *acervus*₉ 2, *maternus*₉ 4, *simplex*₉ 1.—8 t., *cibus*₈ 0 (only 2 t. in *H. S. L.*), *latebrae*₈ 4, *opimus*₈ 4, *septingenti*₈ 0, *ubique*₈ 4 (only 2 t. in *H. S. L.*).—7 t., *acomodo*₇ 1, *bibo*₇ 2, *serpo*₇ 1, [*serpens*₁ 4]—6 t., *avidus*₆ 3, *cubile*₆ 4, *mano*₆ 2, *guaterni*₆ 0, *rus*₆ 2, *semen*₆ 2.—5 t., *alternus*₅ 4, *devenio*₅ 4, *fundo*₅ 3, *ordior*₅ 4, *profundus*₅ 4.—4 t., *atrium*₄ 4, *aridus*₄ 2, *anceps*₄ 4, *circa*₄ 1 (only 1 t. in *H. S. L.*), *confundo*₄ 4, *consurgo*₄ 4, *dens*₄ 4, *ferveo*₄ 4, *fremitus*₄ 4, *frigidus*₄ 4, *lac*₄ 3, *largus*₄ 4, *levis*₄ 4, *maritus*₄ 4, *mel*₄ 4, *nix*₄ 1, *nonaginta*₄ 0, *scindo*₄ 4, *septendecim*₄ 0, *serus*₄ 4, *torreo*₄ 1, *transmitto*₄ 4, *uuro*₄ 4, *vescor*₄ 4, *velox*₄ 4, 2[*viciis*]₄ 4.—3 t., *bacchor*₃ 3, *caro*₃ 0, *gravo*₃ 3, *mico*₃ 3, *nongenti*₃ 0, *quingies*₃ 0, *securus*₃ 3, *sperno*₃ 2, *undecim*₃ 0.—2 t., *edo*₂ 2, *ortus*₂ 2, *subier*₂ 2, *taedet*₂ 2.—1 t., *calidus*₁ 1, *potis*₁ 1, *sero*₁ 1.—0 t., *ceterus*₀ 0, *gracilis*₀ 0.

I do not imply that none of these words ought to be in such a list as we are considering; but whether these words are added "to make up 2,000 in round numbers, for grammatical reasons," or "because study of other authors shows them to be important,"

¹⁰ E. g., No. 798, *hic*, this, *hic*, there, *hac*, *hœc*, *hinc*, *hūc*, one number in the prescribed list, six in the open; similarly *ille*, four; *dum*, five; *si*, eleven; *tum*, six; *superus*, six; *fors*, seven; *res*, seven, etc.

or "because they are identical in form with words included" (homonyms), it must be seen from what follows that their places might be taken by words of more value for reading at sight.

There are about 400 other words in black type not numbered in this 2,000, of which 134 occur *under 5 times* and are, therefore, not reckoned in the open list; but 243 are reckoned, because 53 occur *over 100 times*; 40, *50-100 times*; 54, *25-50 times*; 12, *20-25 times*; 31, *15-20 times*; and 53, *5-15 times*. Since this is a matter of numbering, I give only the words used over 100 times numbered in the open list, which are included, but not numbered, in Professor Lodge's "2,000 words:"

³*abs* ¹²⁶*te* ⁵⁰*bene*, *causā*, ¹⁰*celeriter*, ¹³*certus*, ¹³*consultum*, ⁵⁰*facile*, ⁷*falsus*, ³*fortasse*, ¹³*forte* ¹³³, ²⁵*hic*, ²⁶*legatus*, ²⁶*liberī*, ^{longe} ⁵⁰, ¹⁰⁰*magis* ⁴⁰⁰, ⁵⁰*maxime*, ⁸⁸*minus* ²⁸⁰, ²⁵*modo*, ²⁵*ne* . . . *quidem* ³⁰⁰, ⁷*patria*, ^{plus} ¹¹, ^{postea} ^{quam} ¹¹⁰, ²⁰*praesens*, ²⁵*privatus*, ^{proximus} ⁵⁵, ¹⁰*publice*, ¹⁰⁰*quis* ⁶⁰⁰ (indef.), ⁵⁰*res publica*, ⁵*sanctus*, ²⁰*sicut*, ⁶*sin*, ⁵⁰*sive* ¹¹⁸, ²⁵*solum* ³⁰⁰ ¹⁰⁰*summus* ⁷⁰⁰, ^{superior} ⁵⁰, ⁶*utrum*, ²⁵*vehementer*, ^{vero} ¹⁰⁰, ^{videor} ¹⁰⁰⁰; reckoned, but not separately numbered, in the open list: *animum advertere*, ⁴⁰*armatus*, ¹*conscripti* ²¹⁵, ²¹*cum* . . . *tum* ²⁰¹, ⁹*domi* ¹²⁰, ⁰*non iam*, *neque* . . . *neque* ⁴⁵⁷, *non modo* . . . *sed etiam* ²²⁴, *quid?* ²⁰⁰, ¹²*rem* ¹⁶⁰ *gerere*, ¹⁸*non solum* . . . *sed etiam* ¹⁰⁴, ^{tribunus plebis} ¹⁰⁰—a somewhat unnecessary iteration, perhaps, but to be borne in mind in the apparently big total of 3,240 separate entries in the open list.

More significant are 727 words of *High School Latin* in the open list not included in the prescribed 2,000, although 31 are used *over 100 times*; 53, *50-100 times*; 210, *25-50 times*; 68, *20-25 times*; 118, *15-20 times*; and 247, *5-15 times*. From this list, surely, serviceable substitutes may be selected for the last hundred that gave Professor Lodge so much trouble to select:

100 times: ⁶*edictum*, ¹*ensor*, ⁷*comitium*, ²*condemno*, ¹*conlega*, ²⁵*contio*, ⁶*decretum*, ³*defensio*, ¹²*eius modi* ²²³, ⁵*existimatio*, ^{flagitium}, ^{fundus}, ⁹*idcirco*, ¹⁵*immortalis*, ²⁵*inimicus*, ²*innocens*, ^{maior} (adj.) ¹⁰, ^{maiores} ¹⁰, ⁶*parens*, ²*patronus*, ¹*pontifex*, ⁵*possideo*, ¹*praeclarus*, ⁹*quaestio*, ²*recito*, ⁹*reus*, ⁹*sapientia*, ¹³*senator*, ⁹*societas*, ¹*statua*. The literary value of the words excluded from the prescribed 2,000 may be inferred from portions only of the other groups selected in alphabetical order:

50-100 times: ³*aliquantus* (is reckoned but all the usages are *aliquanto*), ¹*argumentum*, ^{armatura}, ⁶*colonia*, ³*consecro*, ⁸*constantia*, ²*declaro* ¹⁸, ^{defensor}, ³*designo*, ¹¹*decumanus*, ³*disputo*, ⁴*exprimo*, ²*familiaritas*, ^{fanum}, ⁷*fidelis*,

³*fraus*, ³*hereditas*, ²*heres*, ¹⁴*ignominia*, ¹*impius*, ⁶*improbitas*, ¹*impudentia*, ⁶*impurus*, ³*indignus*, ⁴*industria*, ⁶*infinitus*, ¹*inflammo*, etc.

25-50 times: ¹⁶*abduco*, ³*acerbiter*, ¹*adfinis*, ⁶*adiutor*, ¹²*admitto*, etc.

20-25 times: ¹*adiumentum*₂₂, ¹*adprobo*₂₀, ⁶*adsiduus*₂₀, ⁶*aro*₂₀, etc.

15-20 times: ¹*abutor*₁₅, ¹⁶*adicio*, ⁴*adripio*₁₀, ³*adrogantia*₁₂, etc.

5-15 times: ³*abstineo*₁₄, ⁶*abstraho*₇, ⁷*accedit quod*₆, ⁷*accedit ut*₄, etc.

Quite as significant are 349 words in the open list not printed in the prescribed 4,650 at all, for 27 are used over 100 times; 23, 50-100 times; 88, 25-50 times; 44, 20-25 times; 68, 15-20 times; and 99, 5-15 times. To be sure 197 of them do not happen to occur in the prescribed text, and are italicized for omission; but their value for reading at sight may be inferred from the times they are used, selection in alphabetical order:

100 times: ⁶*accusatio*, ⁶*accusator*₂₀₀, ¹*actio*, ⁶*arator*₃₀₀, ¹*sestertius*, etc.

50-100 times: ¹*absolvo*, ¹*lucrum*₅₄, ¹*numquis*₅₄, ⁶*tribunatus*, ⁶*tribus*, etc.

25-50 times: ⁶*actor*, ⁶*actum*, ⁶*adopto*₂₈, ⁶*aedilis*, ¹*aedilitas*, ⁶*atqui*₃₁, etc.

20-25 times: ⁶*advocatus*₂₀, ¹*ambitio*₂₁, ⁶*anulus*₂₁, ⁶*candidatus*₂₃, etc.

15-20 times: ²*adfirmo*₁₆, ²*adsigno*₁₆, ⁶*adversor*₁₆, ⁶*balneum*₁₆, etc.

5-15 times: ⁶*aerumnae*₆, Sallust, ⁶*antesignanus*₂, ¹³*agor*₀, etc.

The quality of the remaining 152 words which occur in *H. S. L.* and are numbered in the open list, but are not printed in Professor Lodge's book at all, may be inferred from the following (the arabic numerals denote books of the *Gallic War*; roman numerals, the four *Cat. orations*; *P. Pomp.*; *A. Archias*):

100 times: ⁷*aequitas*, i. 40; ii. 25; ¹³*certe*, 4. 25; *Pomp.* 2; ⁶*decuma*, *P.* 15; ²*factum*, 3. 14; iii. 27; ¹⁴*quare*, i. 13; i. 12; *quid?*₆₆₂, i. 47; i. 16 (but cf. Lodge's No. 429); ⁴*quod*, 2. 16; iii. 28; ⁶*quod* (ut eo), i. 8; iii. 22; ⁶*siquis*₃₈₂, i. 18; i. 29; ⁶*verum*₃₀₀, i. 4; etc.

50-100 times: ²*aperte*, ii. 6; ¹⁶*malum*, iv. 6; *nonnullus*₂₆, i. 17; ii. 20; ¹¹*nonnunquam*, i. 15; iii. 13; ³*quam ob rem*₈₆, ii. 21; ⁶*scriba*₅₁, iv. 15; ⁶*unā*, 2. 17; 5. 36; iv. 3; etc.

25-50 times: ⁶*age*₂₇, *P.* 46; ⁷*dictum*, 5. 6; i. 39, 40; ⁶*gratiam referre*, i. 35; ³*incommodum*, 5. 52, 53; *mandatum*, i. 37; ³*optimus quisque*₃₁, *P.* 1; *A.* 26; ¹¹*potens*, i. 18; *P.* 4, 60; ⁴*recte*, iii. 7; ⁶*tantummodo*₂₈, *A.* 11, 25; ²*unā cum*₃₉, i. 5; i. 8; etc.

20-25 times: ⁸*excellens*₂₃, *A.* 15; ²*leviter*₂₄, iii. 18; ¹*nece*₂₂, ii. 13; ¹*obscure*₂₁, i. 8; ⁴*occulte*₂₃, iii. 5; ⁹*pacatus*₂₃, i. 6; iii. 22; *P.* 39; ³*penates*₂₃, *Aen.* i. 68; ²*quindecim*₁₁, i. 15; ³*sero*₂₀, 5. 29; i. 5; etc.

15-20 times: ⁶*acerbe*₁₈, iv. 10; ¹*certo* (scio)₁₅, *A.* 32; ¹⁵*imperatum*₀, 2. 3; 5. 20; ⁶*lectus*₁₈, iv. 13; ⁶*orbis terrae*₁₆, i. 13; ⁶*postulatum*₁₅, i. 40; ⁷*praeceptum*₁₈, *A.* 14, 18; *P.* 28; ⁷*praecipue*₁₀, iii. 28; etc.

5-15 times: *agricultura*₀, 3. 17, 4. 1 *bis*; *anguste*₁, 5. 23, 24; *directus*₀, 4. 17; *insolenter*₁, I. 14; II. 20; etc.

Of course, some of these omitted forms may be inferred from parent words included in the 2,000. But it is a poor rule that won't work both ways: has not ability to infer, to derive, to compound words, always been accepted as one of the prime products of language training; and shall the development of this ability now be officially discouraged by "giving in footnotes the meanings of Latin words in the sight passages set for admission to college not contained in the select list of 2,000 words"? I have the utmost sympathy with any move to secure translation "with substantial accuracy and into good English," even to making "no allowance for ignorance of the meaning of words or for slovenly English;" but, somehow, the use of a rigid prescribed list, as recommended in the Middle States plan, does not seem to me to be in the spirit of freedom.

Even as the requirements now stand, and as examinations are now conducted, my experience leads me to believe that 1,900 of this prescribed 2,000 (2,400) will cover 85 to 90 per cent. of the vocabulary work now required of candidates for college. But to increase its efficiency 8 or 9 per cent. it will probably require an increase of one-third in number, to, say, 2,500 words. The user of the open list may reduce it nearly one-fourth in number without impairing its efficiency more than 3 or 4 per cent., for examination purposes (and the index-figures leave him free to do so). But it may properly be urged, isn't the main object of studying Latin to learn how to read it; and is vocabulary efficiency, anyway, reducible to figures and percentages? What proportion to the effort required to turn out a first-class football team does the effort bear which is necessary to secure the infinitesimal excess of efficiency that turns out a winner? Economy isn't applied to football—why should it be to the, I hardly dare say more intellectual, but somewhat less muscular, exercise of Latin? Simply because the attitude of the public, scholastic as well as athletic, is vastly different in its effect on the student mind: the opposition to his game stiffens the student's loyalty to it, because of course its opponents don't know the real thing; the educational

opposition to Latin, on the other hand, confirms his prejudice against it, because of course its opponents, having all tried it, must know what they are talking about! Under these conditions, therefore, the educational value of Latin, taken under protest, frequently "bears no reasonable proportion to the time spent on it."

The sooner classical teachers accept the situation in the shift of emphasis in the culture that counts today, the sooner they will find that the letting-up on some of the things that are *just now* not so important, and the introduction of some economies in arrangement, selection, and method of presentation, will not only prove to be "good business" and bring prompter returns, but also, perhaps, turn the tide that seems to be running against Latin, too, in competition with modern subjects under free election. I am not debating the merits of Latin and Greek. "It is a condition not a theory that confronts us." I am told that there is not a high school in Minnesota teaching Greek. Too strenuous conservatism *may* (I don't say it *will*) involve Latin in a similar fate. I cannot forbear expressing my suspicion that the most dangerous friends of the humanities today are those complacent teachers of the classics who will not abate one jot of their conservatism because, forsooth, it will be a surrender of humanism to Tubal Cain! "If we forbear to tax," said the Tories to Burke, "don't we forfeit our right to tax?" and yielding nothing, they lost all. Let us take warning before a crisis comes. One thing is sure—it is easier to keep a subject in the course than to put it back. There is no short cut to the essentials that can obviate the necessity of good hard work; but if such complementary studies in vocabulary as the two we have been considering (inadequate as they may be, and obviously are, as college requirements) can in any way "deceive the burthen of life" of the poor student who elects Latin, and really wants to learn to read it with rapidity and enjoyment, there ought to be a place for them somewhere. That place, however, I feel sure the Commission to be appointed by the Philological Association will decide is not as a rider on a national movement for uniform requirements and for perfect freedom of choice.

EDITORIAL NOTES

From various sources the cry resounds that our schools, or our boys—or both—are being “feminized.” When the term is applied to the

schools it signifies either that the teachers and pupils are chiefly feminine, or that the studies are feminine in their subject-matter or in the way in which they are taught.

When the term is applied to the schools in either of these senses, it is usually alleged as an explanation for the absence of boys from our high schools, and from the upper grades of the elementary or grammar schools. But in the view of some the evil is more actively pernicious. It not merely infects the institution and thereby keeps the more rugged type of boys away, thus doing them as it were a negative injury; it is held that like the glance of the mother-in-law or the contagion of female wearing apparel in savage life, the predominantly feminine atmosphere of the schools so infects those males who are weak enough to remain voluntarily, or are forced by unwise parents to sojourn in it, that the boys become themselves effeminate and unfit for the serious business of life in a man's world where there are blows to give and take, struggles and contests, with no mercy to the weakling and only contempt for him who asks favors.

President G. S. Hall has laid especial stress upon the matter of discipline. He is reported as referring to the present order as a “saccharine benignity” in contrast with the masculine rule of older days. He advocates corporal punishment as a means of discipline. But it would be unjust to President Hall to make him appear, as the newspaper headlines and even some of his published work would indicate, a believer that the great burning need in education at this time is more flogging. He would probably be far from claiming that the inducement of a liberal use of the rod would at once fill the empty seats on the male side. The domination of the school by the college, the intellectual as versus the manual emphasis, the lack of vocational training, are all a part of his indictment.

The latest recruit to the anti-feminist crusade is Dr. Howard in the *American Magazine*. Not satisfied with demanding the introduction of more men into the teaching body, he would eliminate women entirely. Nor would he stop here. He would eliminate all the men at present employed and replace them with “virile male teachers.” For under present conditions, when the pupils are mainly girls, and the majority of the teachers are women, the lone males who are willing to remain in the high schools are “sissies” or at least “book instructors;” and the books must go too. In their place “must be put forges, carpenters’ benches, draughting

instruments, simple and practical laboratories, and a man's gymnasium and swimming-pool."

These complaints fall under two main heads—the subject matter and the personnel of our schools.

As applied to the subject-matter the term feminization is grotesquely out of place and only tends to obscure the true issue. Just what studies are essentially "feminine"? According to Dr. Howard anything learned from books is liable to this charge. According to others less radical, it is pre-eminently such studies as English or Latin; while natural science or history or mathematics is not. But points of view change here with bewildering rapidity. Only a little while ago, in the schooling of the writer's grandmother, English grammar was unfit for girls—it was exclusively masculine, while but a decade ago the writer was informed by a teacher in a southern city which has never lacked "virility" in its men, that Latin was there regarded as entirely inappropriate for women—it would render them masculine. And who does not recall the cry that went up when women's colleges began their work. Anything but Greek! Greek would surely defeminize woman. The capacity of the classics to unsex both boys and girls is certainly surprising. So far as this particular point is concerned we imagine the effect of actually effeminizing boys is like the report of Mark Twain's death—greatly exaggerated. Our doctors and lawyers—at least one of them—if not our teachers, seem to have survived the experience and make on the whole fairly vigorous men.

The real trouble is not that the schools are "feminine" in the subjects taught, nor do we get at the main issue in the matter of personnel when we say that there are not men enough in the schools. As regards subject-matter it might be well maintained that it is more remote from an ideal training for the average woman than it is from an ideal training for the average man. And as regards personnel it may be strongly questioned whether the mere exchange of women for men, other conditions remaining the same, would go very far in the way of improvement.

In both cases the root of the trouble is that the community, especially in cities, is thrusting upon the schools a task which was not required of them in the preceding generation and for which they are not equipped either materially, personally, or in respect to the organization of their subject-matter of instruction. When our boys and girls got the bulk of their education at home or in the various occupations which acted as practical training schools, the school supplied what was needed, and for those who were going to college, it gave the needed preparation. When the boys associated with their fathers at home or in the father's trade or business during the most of the time it mattered little whether during the few months of school which the average boy over twelve had, he was taught his grammar and arithmetic by a man or by a woman.

OBSCURING
THE ISSUE

THE REAL
PROBLEM

Now that city homes furnish no opportunity for active work, while the factory and large shop or office offer little work for boys that is educative we have an entirely new problem in subject matter and method. Now that the boys get no companionship from their fathers—and under the existing industrial organization can get none in most cases—the schools must provide the right sort of companionship through its teachers or this will be lacking entirely. Here, then, are two real and fundamental aspects of a problem forced upon the schools by an industrial and social revolution. As scientific educators let us not blur this issue by raising a cry of “feminization,” as though the present lack of adjustment between the schools and social needs were to be charged up to the women teachers.

In asking what reconstruction is necessary we may premise without discussion that it is desirable to have more men in the teaching body. The average boy would naturally feel that he had got into the wrong entrance to a man's work if he found only women on duty as guides. Nor on the other hand is the average unmarried woman likely to sympathize with all the tendencies of rough manhood in the making. She may command the fullest intellectual respect—and, for one, the writer believes that boys should come under the influence of strong women to give him intellectual respect for women—but the game of intellectual acuteness, or refinement of manner, or even of fineness of spirit, is not the only game that the average boy wants to play. He needs the comradeship and strength of the man who is a master in the other games of a man's world of action. And we believe that when the community appreciates the situation and is furnished a clear programme by educators, it will provide the funds necessary to secure good men. At present, we need not point out what is too obvious—the same industrial, economic, and social changes which have imposed the new problems on the schools have raised the standard of living, and offered large inducements in other occupations, thereby making it almost an impossibility to secure the best type of men for any except the more important administrative positions in the teaching body. We wish now rather to emphasize the other side of the matter, namely, that such an increase of men would not in itself meet the situation, nor is it likely to be obtained until it is made clear what the men are wanted to do which cannot be done by women.

First, then, we need to make over our traditional curriculum and methods of teaching with reference to the needs of *all* children under our present conditions. Various experiments have been made in this direction, and we need not recapitulate them here. But no one would claim that we have made more than a beginning. We believe that the states and the nation should undertake much more thorough experimentation to see what can be done in giving a training that shall connect at one end with the boy or girl and at the other with the world of thought and action into

THE TWO LINES OF
RECONSTRUCTION

which the boy and girl enter when the school is left, and shall keep them active and growing all the way.

Secondly, and this we have scarcely touched at all in public schools, we need to build up a corporate life in the school, in addition to the work of the classroom. The intellectual contact of mind with mind is a noble thing at its best, but even so it is not the whole. And for boys from twelve to eighteen it is very far from being the whole. Comradeship in games, in excursions, in clubs of various kinds, gives far better opportunity for effective masculine influence in many ways than does the official and formal meeting of the classroom. The great need of men is not for the sake of flogging the few unruly boys—some of whom need a physician and most of whom probably need a different kind of work to do, that will employ their surplus energies or stimulate their indifference—but for the sake of positive infusion of generous, manly spirit into the activities which every healthy boy needs. Here is where give and take, co-operation and fairness, and the qualities which we recognize as “manly” may be especially fostered. To secure men who will do this work, and command at once the boys’ respect and cordial co-operation, the community may well pay a special price, and the right type of men may well feel that it offers a reward for the finest ambitions.

J. H. T.

BOOK REVIEWS

Individual Training in Our Colleges. By CLARENCE F. BIRDSEYE. New York: Macmillan, 1907. Pp. xxvi+434.

This book is at once a history of American colleges, a criticism of their present condition, and a suggestion for their reformation. It is written not from the standpoint of the self-educated man who has no faith in college education, but from that of a college graduate who desires to see this a source of efficiency. The historical chapters are designed to show that the early college was a training school with definite aims. It sought to prepare men for the learned professions; it did this by means of a narrow but disciplinary curriculum, by methods of instruction which were thorough and definite, and by a personal oversight which kept the student under the direct influence of the faculty.

This historical background is used as a contrast with the existing college and university system. The influence of the German university, economic and social changes since the Civil War, the growth of population, especially by immigration, are among the factors which have modified radically the earlier educational situation. The author asserts that in many ways the new high school has taken the place of the old college and that the college student of today finds himself in an anomalous position. He is neither an academy pupil nor an old-time college student under the personal care of his teachers nor is he mature enough for the free, untrammelled life of the German university type. In connection with the growth of this new situation, Mr. Birdseye points out the effects of the increase of wealth and of the demoralizing absorption in competitive intercollegiate athletics. Social distinctions, ostentation, luxury, lack of respect for scholarship, low standards of sportsmanship, have been the inevitable consequences.

Problem solving is to Mr. Birdseye the test of education. If the educational process is successful it should turn out problem solvers, i.e., men able to analyze situations and to meet them with promptness, precision, and efficiency. This the old type of college was able to do for a relatively simple society. But with the increased complexities of modern life college education seems unable to cope. There is a chaos in educational theory and practice. The idea of culture is declared to be not only vague but often actually emasculating. The elective system leads to desultory and illogical curricula, filled with "introductory" and "soft" courses. The majority of college students have no conception of genuine mental effort. College faculties are no longer able to exercise personal supervision. The demands of scholarship and other duties more and more absorb the time of college teachers. Mr. Birdseye seeks to be fair in his distribution of blame but he presses the business analogy too insistently and too far. He reiterates the charge that judged by business or factory standards, the college is a failure. Only because there is no definite way of testing results is the situation tolerated. The professional and technical school can be tested and

hence is compelled to maintain a high standard of exaction, and to give individual training. The college on the other hand is subject to no such tests. It behooves trustees and faculties to bestir themselves, to make their aims more definite, to revise their curricula, to secure good teachers, to study individual needs, and to do for today what the old-fashioned colleges did for their times.

After picturing the demoralized condition of higher education, the author describes the rise and present status of the fraternity system, and reaches the conclusion that the fraternity offers the only available substitute for the oversight which was once provided by the small college. He urges therefore with a good deal of detail the claims of the "fraternity family" for careful consideration as an aid to individual training. He shows the way in which his own fraternity has devised a system of national supervision and has in many instances achieved gratifying results. The book concludes with a chapter of direct, wholesome, and stimulating advice to college trustees and faculties, to parents, and to the alumni of fraternities on whom rests the responsibility for maintaining a sound fraternity life.

The book deals with a variety of problems. It is written with much knowledge, with keen insight, and with sincere conviction. Even though college administrators and teachers may question many statements of fact or inference, they cannot fail to respect the author of the book nor to be deeply impressed by the truths which he presses home vividly, vigorously, and insistently.

GEORGE E. VINCENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Economics for High Schools and Academies. By FRANK W. BLACKMAR, Ph.D. New York: Macmillan, 1907. \$1.20 net.

This little volume which aims, as its title indicates, to bring the study of economic life within the mental range of high-school boys and girls should be examined with a consideration for the difficulty of the task which the author of such a book undertakes. Any intelligent study of economic laws must rest upon a considerable amount of personal observation and some general knowledge of industrial development. The time allowed to political economy where it is given any place at all in the curriculums of our secondary schools is not more than twenty and often only ten weeks. A textbook which is planned to meet these conditions, which tries to give a general account of industrial development, to discuss the fundamental laws of economics and to apply these laws to existing conditions within the compass of about four hundred short pages must, of necessity, be abstruse or superficial in spots.

Book I gives a brief but interesting outline of industrial evolution. Under the heading, "Private Economics," the four parts of Book II deal respectively with the laws of consumption, production, distribution, and exchange, while Book III, under "Public Economics," takes up the questions of government restriction and control and taxation and revenue.

The style of the author is dogmatic rather than suggestive. It is unfortunate that he felt obliged to settle within so small a compass so many important questions that have been perplexing the minds of economists, business men, and statesmen for a great many years. The following extracts will serve as an

example of his manner of dealing with these questions: "It is objected that trusts raise prices by restricting production and keeping down wages. The fact is, the trusts to date have paid as high wages as the lesser corporations; and when it is observed that there is an opportunity to pay higher wages there than elsewhere, no doubt wage-earners will receive their full share of the business." And again, "And it is a fact that on account of the concentration of a given industry prices are more stable under the organization of the trust, and that in the long run they average lower than under the competition of many small concerns. The wants of a community, both in manufacture and trade are more carefully estimated by this means of social organization." While it is quite generally conceded that the trust is an economical instrument in the *production* of wealth, there is a widespread feeling that it has interfered very seriously with the *distribution* of wealth. It would be interesting therefore to know where the writer found the figures upon which he bases his "facts."

About the best results that the teacher of economics in high schools and colleges can hope to receive are an awakened interest in economic questions, an open mind in seeking for the truth, and some knowledge of the process by which that truth may be reached. A few of the great principles of the subject are about as well established as the laws of mathematics and physics. These and the process of reasoning by which they have been determined furnish some excellent material for intellectual drill, but a forcing into immature and unprepared minds of a lot of cut-and-dried conclusions based upon insufficient data is apt to result in mental dyspepsia and a distaste ever after for anything that savors of an economic diet.

EDWARD E. HILL

CHICAGO NORMAL SCHOOL

Teaching a District School. By JOHN WIRT DINSMORE. New York: The American Book Co., 1908. Pp. 246. \$1.

This interesting book is evidently designed to place before those who expect to teach in rural schools, or those who are already engaged in such work, an outline on the essence of teaching and what the child and his parents may expect to receive from the public school. It is written in a simple and easy style which makes it attractive and at the same time practical.

The first five chapters deal with the individuality of the teacher and the special problems of the schoolroom. How thoroughly a young person from eighteen to twenty-one years of age, such as we find in most rural schools, can answer the personal questions is difficult to state. The inquiries are clear and to the point and must make an impression. The standard set is not too high. The suggestions for the first day of school are rather too elaborate and would not be practical in the rural schools at present.

Parents should understand that in all common-law states the teacher stands in the place of the parent and has full control of the child. The parents' duties to the school are legal as well as moral under our laws. Reading is not the proper basis today for classifying a rural school. The average of the subjects of reading, arithmetic, language, and geography should be made the basis of classification. The daily programme which the author suggests should be

revised to cover eight grades to conform to the general gradation of both rural and city schools. The foregoing suggestions refer to chaps. i and ii.

In chaps. iii, iv, and v we should note that the outline in number work given does not conform to present standards. There should be no formal work in numbers or recitations in numbers in the first three years. Written reviews or lessons should be limited in number and should not occur at stated periods. The author suggests every ten lessons which, if practiced, would be unfortunate. The "props" and "spurs" for the teachers as stated are most excellent and the words of warning and information found in chap. v are most timely.

Chap. vi on "Love as a Factor in Teaching" should be considered by itself. It is an essential part of the book, but is really a book in itself. Both parents and teachers should understand that they express their greatest love for the child when they insist that he shall grow naturally, behave properly, conform strictly to the best usages of society, and obey to the letter the rules established for the government of the home and the school. Prompt obedience to legally constituted authority is the basis of good citizenship.

Chaps. vii, viii, ix, and x deal with the real practical work of a schoolroom and the author speaks with considerable definiteness of the several subjects to be taught and of the aim to be kept in mind by the teacher. The author is especially happy in his suggestions regarding "reading" and the thought concerning "home reading" is a valuable one for every teacher. It is probable that in dealing with the practical in arithmetic we attempt too much and the author is not quite clear on this subject. The thoughts concerning "history" and "citizenship" are most excellent.

The suggestions in chap. ix on "industries" are very timely. The author, however, speaks rather briefly on the topic of "occupations for women."

Chaps. x and xi deal with the government of the school and the harvesting of results and these form a very appropriate conclusion to the work. The great problem in all school work is the teacher. The teacher's work is to take the "raw material," the boy, and through example, suggestion, direction, and inspiration develop the proper man. The author's suggestions are most excellent on this point. The test of every proposition is the result attained. Therefore, the harvesting of the results becomes most important. The "school exhibition" and the "school exposition" offer excellent opportunities for practical tests. The introduction of special-day exercises into school work gives opportunity for real culture, and the exposition should include a "fair" or a display of the various products of the school district or township.

In conclusion, Mr. Dinsmore's book is thoroughly sound and as stated before he has arranged a most complete outline for the teacher and I feel sure that the educational work of our country would be materially benefited could every teacher have access to this estimable little book. The author and the publishers are to be congratulated on its general excellence.

WALTER H. FRENCH

MICHIGAN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

A Manual for the Study of Insects. By JOHN HENRY COMSTOCK AND ANNA BOTSFORD COMSTOCK. 5th ed revised. Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Co., 1907. Pp. xi+701.

This manual has been the standard textbook of the insects of this country ever since the publication of the first edition in 1895. It was written in order to provide in one volume a general account of all the orders and families together with analytical keys. It was of course impossible to consider in detail even a small proportion of the thousands of species of insects that have been described. The authors have made an effort to select those species that are of economic importance, and have given clear accounts of their life-histories, and the methods of destroying those that are noxious. This has made the book of special value to agricultural students. Throughout the volume there is an evident attempt to make the study of entomology as simple as possible without sacrificing accuracy. A great advance toward a unification of the entire subject was made by the senior author when he succeeded in bringing order out of the systems of naming wing-veins. Homologous wing-veins, contrary to the previous custom, have been given the same terms throughout all the orders of insects. The plan of the volume is as follows: An instructive introduction passes in review the near relatives of the insects—Crustacea, Arachnida, and Myriopoda. The general characteristics of insects are then briefly considered, after which a chapter is devoted to each order. Anna Botsford Comstock is responsible for many excellent wood-cuts. Mr. E. P. Felt and Mr. R. H. Pettit have also furnished a number of the illustrations.

First Course in Biology. By L. H. BAILEY AND WALTER M. COLEMAN. New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. xxv+592. \$1.25.

This book is a departure from any heretofore published, for it not only considers as usual the biology of plants and animals, but has a third coordinate part relating to the human body. We have naught but praise to offer for this new addition, as children, and adults also, know very little about themselves and are slow to apply to their own persons the principles of biology learned in their study of the plants and lower animals.

Professor L. H. Bailey is responsible for Part I, "Plant Biology," 204 pages. As might be expected from the contents of his previous textbooks, he has treated his subject from the nature-study standpoint and has endeavored, we think with success, to interest the student in the plants with which he comes in daily contact, by a general knowledge of how these organisms live, grow, and reproduce. Those familiar with this author's *Botany* and *Lessons with Plants* need no further exposition of the first part of the text under consideration.

Part II, "Animal Biology," 224 pages, is by Walter M. Coleman. Here the "logical order" of study is pursued by introducing the protozoa first and working up the scale of life to the vertebrates. We do not consider this the best method of treatment because of the difficulties connected with the study of unicellular animals. We shall not, however, state the arguments pro and con, but refer the reader to a good discussion of this subject in chap. vi on "The Teaching of Biology in the Secondary School," by F. E. Lloyd and M. A.

Bigelow. Mr. Coleman has reinforced the study of the structure of the various types by accounts of the physiology of the different organs, the economic importance of the animal, and the methods of collecting.

Part III, "Human Biology," 164 pages, also by Mr. Coleman, fills a need which has only recently been recognized by textbook writers. We would compare this part of the volume to *The Human Mechanism*, by Theodore Hough and W. T. Sedgwick. The following is the order of subjects: The skin and kidneys, the skeleton, the muscles, the circulation, the respiration, food and digestion, the nervous system, the senses, bacteria, and sanitation. At the beginning of each chapter are helpful experiments introducing the student to the actual physiological processes to be studied.

A quotation from the preface will give a good idea of the arrangement of the subjects advised by the authors: "If the course in biology begins in the fall (with the school year), it may be well to study plant biology two days in the week and animal biology three days, until midwinter; when outdoor material becomes scarce, human biology may be followed five days in the week; in spring, plants may be studied three days and animals two days." The book is profusely illustrated in the text and also contains four colored plates which are of value for the proper teaching of biology.

R. W. HEGNER

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Elementary Algebra. By J. W. A. YOUNG, PH.D., AND LAMBERT L. JACKSON, PH.D. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1908. Pp. 438.

During the past few years there has been no lack of criticism of the traditional course in algebra. It has been pointed out with the utmost clearness that the course is unsuited to immature boys and girls just entering the high school, that it is too abstract, and that it lacks all connection with real life. In response to this sentiment, some slight modifications have appeared in many of the recent textbooks mainly in the introduction of graphical methods and in the elimination of certain topics. The book under consideration represents another step toward the new algebra.

Although the authors were hampered by the necessity of providing for the prevailing requirements for admission to college, they have made a book which, in many respects, appears new. It is evidently planned with due regard for the capacity of the high-school student and with the purpose of convincing him from the beginning that algebra is good for something.

The first few chapters are devoted to an interesting transition from arithmetic to algebra, in which the value of algebraic symbols for making statements in abbreviated form is explained, and the use of the equation is illustrated by simple problems. The negative number is not introduced until chap. iv.

New topics are as a rule presented inductively. Various simple examples, often relating to arithmetical data, are first considered, from which a general relation is inferred. This is followed by a variety of oral exercises and finally problems requiring written work. At the end of each chapter is a summary.

The arrangement of topics suggests the "Spiral" course in arithmetic.

The equation appears again and again, each time receiving more comprehensive treatment. Factoring is first considered in connection with multiplication. Later a special chapter is devoted to the subject, in which the facts already learned are summarized and the methods extended. Other topics receiving attention at more than one stage in the development of the course are ratio and proportion and variation. There is no separate chapter on graphs, but graphical methods are introduced freely. The arrangement lends itself readily to a distribution of the work over two or more years. Indeed, such treatment is doubtless expected by the authors for, while the first chapters can be readily understood by eighth-grade pupils, the treatment of the latter part of the book is suited to students of much greater maturity.

The most interesting feature of the book is the problems. One misses the familiar transactions of A, B, and C, and the time-honored conversations between father and son in regard to their ages. Instead, we have statistics of area, population, exports, and crops, composition of foods, and geographical data. There are also many exercises drawn from physics and geometry. A few problems of historic interest are given in supplementary sections. Many of the problems are, of course, not real, that is, not of the sort requiring solution by algebraic methods. They are manufactured—like the problems about sheep and ages—to illustrate algebraic processes. Nevertheless the book contains an unusually large number of problems which are drawn from real life.

WILLIAM E. STARK

THE ETHICAL CULTURE SCHOOL
NEW YORK CITY

High-School Manual-Training Course in Wood Work. By SAMUEL E. RITCHEY. New York: American Book Co., 1905. Pp. 223.

This is a book of 223 double-column pages. It attempts to cover the four subjects of joinery, turning, cabinetwork, and patternwork. The author states that the course as given in the text has been in use, in its entirety, in his classes for several years, and that it was originally prepared to save the time of the pupil by avoiding much of the writing in his notebooks.

In addition to the text on the above subjects is a section on equipment, also a chapter on wood, giving in a brief manner some fragmentary facts, and a little fiction, in regard to the common woods and their uses.

From the information furnished in regard to the equipment and supplies and the amount of work done by the pupils as indicated by other pages of the book, it appears that in the author's school the use of this course requires a large amount of equipment and materials for very limited results.

As is common with books of this class the attempt is made to show the methods of tool usage by means of sketches. These, as a rule, are clear and evidently show what the author intended, although good tool usage would conflict in many cases with the methods shown.

In treating the subject of wood turning the author evidently had in mind the making of a few forms for exhibition rather than the teaching of anything which would aid the pupil, should he ever attempt to do commercial work. This does not appear to be a proper course for school use when correct methods

are so easily learned. The designs given are too intricate for the beginner and are certain to cause improper methods of work in order to execute them, the net result to the pupil being of little, if any, value.

Cabinet making follows turning and in the same general plan of work. The glove-box, the octagonal taboret, and similar objects, discarded by up-to-date schools, find a prominent place in the text.

Methods of moulding are treated as a preliminary to pattern making and make clear some important features of the work. The chapter on pattern making treats quite clearly several problems. It is doubtful, however, if the beginner can grasp the general principles of such work from the study of such unrelated matter, however valuable it may be in its details.

As a whole the book would require a great deal of supplementary oral instruction from the teacher to be of much value to one who is attempting to learn these subjects. It might be a positive disadvantage by suggesting so many unrelated ideas which the teacher would need to take time to explain.

FRANK HENRY SELDEN

University of Chicago High School

Elementary Pedagogy. By LEVI SEELEY, PH.D. New York: Hinds, Noble, & Eldredge, 1906. Pp. x+337. \$1.25.

This book is professedly a beginner's book, though presupposing some knowledge of general psychology. It is general in character, discussing briefly a wide range of topics, including the aim of education, the educational processes, methods of instruction, laws of development, training of the will, religious education, etc. The point of view is broadly Hegelian, reconstructed in terms of more recent thought. The general spirit of the book is cultural rather than technical. It is a fair question to raise whether for beginners it might not have been well to have laid relatively more stress on the practical questions relating to the teaching processes and methods of instruction. The book is well analyzed for teaching purposes. Every chapter is supplied with a list of references at its head and a concise summary at its close. The references would be still more valuable for beginners if they specified particular chapters or pages.

IRVING ELGAR MILLER

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Protection of the Innocent. By WILLIAM LEE HOWARD, M.D. Chicago: Press of the American Medical Association, 1906. Pp. 11.

This little pamphlet, reprinted from the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, is primarily addressed to physicians, but every parent or teacher of adolescent girls may well take its serious message to heart. To one of Dr. Howard's experience it is not strange that it seems absurd for our teachers in high schools to "attempt to give to their disinterested scholars academic fancies regarding the physiologic action of a glass of beer, meanwhile oblivious to the adolescents' silent appeals for some true statement regarding the laws of nature."

J. H. T.

BOOKS RECEIVED

EDUCATION

- The Teacher.* Essays and Addresses on Education. By GEORGE HERBERT PALMER AND ALICE FREEMAN PALMER. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1908. Pp. 395. \$1.50.
- Textbook of School and Class Management: Theory and Practice.* By FELIX ARNOLD. New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. 409.
- Pestalozzi: An Account of His Life and Work.* By H. HOLMAN. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908. Pp. 322. \$0.75.
- Education and National Character.* By HENRY CHURCHILL KING, FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY, LYMAN ABBOTT, WASHINGTON GLADDEN, AND OTHERS, Chicago: Religious Education Association. Pp. 319. \$1.50.
- The Educational Ideal in the Ministry.* (The Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in the Year 1908.) By WILLIAM H. P. FAUNCE. New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. 286. \$1.25.
- The Origin and Early Development of the English Universities to the Close of the Thirteenth Century.* By EARNEST VANCOURT VAUGHN. "University of Missouri Studies in Social Science," Vol. II, No. 2. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1908. Pp. 147. \$1.00.
- Medical Inspection of Schools.* By LUTHER HALSEY GULICK AND LEONARD P. AYRES. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1908. Pp. 274. \$1.00.
- World Book of Temperance.* Biblical, Historical, and Scientific Temperance Lessons. By DR. AND MRS. WILBUR F. CRAFTS. Washington: International Reform Bureau, 1908. Pp. 128. \$0.75.

ENGLISH

- Composition Rhetoric-Literature.* A Four-Years' Course for Secondary Schools. By MARTHA HALE SHACKFORD AND MARGARET JUDSON. Boston: Benj. H. Sanborn & Co., 1908. Pp. 464. \$1.12.
- Special Method in Reading in the Grades.* Including the Oral Treatment of Stories and the Reading of Classics. By CHARLES A. McMURRY. New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. 351. \$1.25.
- Specimens of Exposition and Argument.* Compiled by MILTON PERCIVAL AND R. A. JELLIFFE. New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. 362. \$0.90.
- The Tragedy of Macbeth.* "The New Hudson Shakespeare." Edited and revised by E. C. BLACK AND A. J. GEORGE. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1908. Pp. 159. \$0.50.
- King Henry the Fifth.* "The New Hudson Shakespeare." Edited and revised by E. C. BLACK AND A. J. GEORGE. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1908. Pp. 176. \$0.50.

The Vision of Sir Launfal and Other Poems of James Russell Lowell. Edited, with introduction and notes, by JULIAN W. ABERNETHY. New York: Charles E. Merrill Co., 1908. Pp. 172. \$0.25.

Joseph: A Drama for Children. By FLETCHER H. SWIFT; with an introduction by RICHARD M. HODGE. New York: Wm. B. Harison, 1907. Pp. 31. \$0.25.

LATIN

C. Sallustii Crispi Bellum Catilinae. Edited, with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by DANIEL A. PENICK. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1908. Pp. 171.

GERMAN

A First German Book. By GEORGE M. HOWE. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1908. Pp. 223.

Der Bibliothekar. By GUSTAV VON MOSER. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary by HOLLON A. FARR. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1908. Pp. 175. \$0.40.

Lotti, die Uhrmacherin. By MARIE VON ERNER-ESCHENBACH. Edited with Notes and Introduction by GEORGE HENRY NEEDLER. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1908.

FRENCH

Les Misérables. Par VICTOR HUGO. Edited with Introduction and Notes by DOUGLAS L. BUFFUM. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1908. Pp. 566. \$1.25.

MATHEMATICS

A First Course in Algebra. By WEBSTER WELLS. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1908. Pp. 232. \$1.00.

A Secondary Arithmetic. Commercial and Industrial. By JOHN C. STONE AND JAMES F. MILLIS. Boston: Benj. H. Sanborn & Co., 1908. Pp. 221. \$0.75.

HISTORY AND CIVICS

Texts of the Peace Conferences at the Hague, 1899 and 1907. With English Translation and Appendix of Related Documents. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. Prefatory Note by ELIHU ROOT. Boston and London: Ginn & Co., for the International School of Peace, 1908. Pp. 447. \$2.20.

Poems of American History. Collected and edited by BURTON EGBERT STEVENSON. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1908. Pp. 704. \$3.00.

The American Executive and Executive Methods. ("The American State Series.") By JOHN FINLEY AND JOHN F. SANDERSON. New York: The Century Co., 1908. Pp. 352. \$1.25.

The American as He Is. By NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER. New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. 104. \$1.00.

An Outline of Economics. By JOHN DANIELS. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1908. Pp. 28. \$0.40.

MISCELLANEOUS

Essentials of Woodworking. By IRA SAMUEL GRIFFITH. Illustrated by EDWIN V. LAWRENCE. Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press, 1908. Pp. 182. \$1.25.

Problems in Mechanical Drawing. By CHARLES A. BENNETT. Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press, 1908. Pp. 18 and 88 plates. \$1.00.

- Book of Alphabets for Use in Schools.* By H. W. SHAYLOR. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1908. Pp. 24. \$0.10.
- Robinsono Kruso.* De DANIELO DEFO. (Esperanto Translation.) Henry Altemus Co., Philadelphia, 1908. Pp. 143. \$0.50.
- The Child-Lore Dramatic Reader.* By CATHERINE T. BRYCE. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1908. Pp. 115.
- A First Book in Phonics.* By FLORENCE AKIN. Boston: Atkinson, Mentzer & Grover, 1908. Pp. 62.
- Christ Legends.* By SELMA LAGERLÖF. Translated from the Swedish by VELMA SWANSTON HOWARD. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1908. Pp. 272. \$1.25.

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL LITERATURE IN THE PERIODICALS¹

IRENE WARREN

Librarian, School of Education, The University of Chicago

- ADAMS, VICTORIA A. Delphi and the teacher of history. *Educa. Bi-mo.* 3:135. (D. '08.)
- ADAMSON, JOHN WILLIAM. Some impressions of the international moral congress. *School World.* 10:412-14. (N. '08.)
- ARNOLD, FELIX. Classification and education of afflicted children. *Psycholog. Clin.* 2:180-91. (N. '08.)
- BAIN, A. WATSON. Preparation in the elementary school for industrial and domestic life. *El. School T.* 9:167-77. (D. '08.)
- BASCOMB, JOHN. Co-education. *Educa. R.* 36:442-51. (D. '08.)
- BEDINGER, GEORGE RUST. Japanese college students. *Out.* 90:626-28. (N. '08.)
- (The) Berea college case. *Out.* 90:757-58. (D. '08.)
- BOONE, CHESHIRE L. A course of study in manual training. *Man. Train. Mag.* 10:123-33. (D. '08.)
- BUSH-BROWN, HENRY K. Work, study, and play for every child: a system of education that would make for better mental, moral, and physical development. *Craftsman.* 15:330-37. (N. '08.)
- BUTLER, NICHOLAS MURRAY. Training for vocation and for avocation. *Educa. R.* 36:471-74. (D. '08.)
- DALY, W. E. The education of a marine engineer. *Cassier.* 35:73-78. (N. '08.)
- DEGROOT, E. B. Recent playground development in Chicago. *Amer. Phys. Educa. R.* 13:462-67. (N. '08.)
- DE LA PAZ, FABIAN A. Education in the Philippines. *Educa.* 29:239-47. (D. '08.)
- DOREY, MILNOR. Should secondary schools teach the Bible? *School R.* 16:680-82. (D. '08.)
- FRENCH, CHARLES W. Social education. *Educa. Bi-mo.* 3:136-47. (D. '08.)

¹ *Abbreviations.*—*Amer. Phys. Educa. R.*, American Physical Education Review; *Atlan.*, Atlantic Monthly; *Chaut.*, Chautauquan; *Educa.*, Education; *Educa. Bi-mo.*, Educational Bi-monthly; *Educa. R.*, Educational Review; *El. School T.*, Elementary School Teacher; *Harp. W.*, Harpers' Weekly; *Journ. of Educa. (Bost.)*, Journal of Education (Boston); *Lib. Journ.*, Library Journal; *Man. Train. Mag.*, Manual Training Magazine; *Out.*, Outlook; *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, Popular Science Monthly; *Psycholog. Clin.*, Psychological Clinic; *Pub. Lib.*, Public Libraries; *School R.*, School Review; *South. Educa. R.*, Southern Educational Review; *Teach. Coll. Rec.*, Teachers College Record.

- FRENCH, WALTER H. Agriculture in the public school. *El. School T.* 9:186-91. (D. '08.)
- GOWDY, JEAN L. The educational value of the essentially motor activities. *Man. Train. Mag.* 10:97-103. (D. '08.)
- GRIFFITH, IRA S. Methods and arrangement of subject-matter in grammar-school woodworking. *Man. Train. Mag.* 10:148-60. (D. '08.)
- GUTHRIE, MARY G. Some principles of history teaching. *Educa. Bi-mo.* 3:110. (D. '08.)
- HAMANN, ALBERT. The higher education of women in Prussia. *Educa. R.* 36:433-41. (D. '08.)
- HANEY, JAMES P. The London art congress. *Man. Train. Mag.* 10:110-22.
- HARPER, PAUL VINCENT. Student life in Bonn: the impressions of an American student. *Chaut.* 52:427-33. (N. '08.)
- HETHERINGTON, CLARK W. Report of committee on a normal course in play. *Amer. Phys. Educa. R.* 13:472-74. (N. '08.)
- HIBBARD, GEORGE. The playground from the standpoint of the executive officer of the city. *Amer. Phys. Educa. R.* 13:455-61. (N. '08.)
- HILL, EDWARD E. The value of the study of society in elementary and secondary schools. *Educa. Bi-mo.* 3:129-34. (D. '08.)
- HILL, PATTY SMITH. The value and limitations of Froebel's gifts as educative materials. Pts. 3, 4, 5. *El. School T.* 9:192-201. (D. '08.)
- HOSIC, JAMES FLEMING. The elementary course in English. Pt. 2. *Educa. Bi-mo.* 3:159-89. (D. '08.)
- HULL, M. W. The value of time and material. *Man. Train. Mag.* 10:161-63. (D. '08.)
- JERNEGAN, MARCUS WILSON. An unsolved problem in secondary education. *Educa. Bi-mo.* 3:111-22. (D. '08.)
- JOHNSTON, W. DAWSON. The library of the bureau of education. *Educa. R.* 36:452-57. (D. '08.)
- KAUFFMAN, EUNICE HUGHES. A school in the forest. *Out.* 90:793-95. (D. '08.)
- KAVANA, ROSE M. Concerning method in history. *Educa. Bi-mo.* 3:128. (D. '08.)
- KENT, ERNEST B. The elementary school and industrial occupations. *El. School T.* 9:178-85. (D. '08.)
- LANE, WILLIAM COOLIDGE. A central bureau of information and loan collection for college libraries. *Lib. Journ.* 33:429-33. (N. '08.)
- LARSSON, GUSTOF. Otto Solomon. *Man. Train. Mag.* 10:104-9. (D. '08.)
- LUCK, F. C. Ethics of education. *Educa.* 29:201-12. (D. '08.)
- MARK, E. H. Compulsory school attendance. *South. Educa. R.* 5:119-30. (N. '08.)
- MARTIN, EDWARD S. President Eliot—a great man. *Harp. W.* 52:7. (N. '08.)

- MARVIN, GEORGE. The American spirit in Chinese education. *Out.* 90:667-72. (N. '08.)
- MILLER, KELLY. Forty years of negro education. *Educa. R.* 36:484-98. (D. '08.)
- NELSON, J. RALEIGH. A revival of the Megalensian games. *School R.* 16:660-63. (D. '08.)
- NOYES, WILLIAM. Function of constructive activities in education. Pt. 1. *Journ. of Educa. (Bost.)* 68:589-91. (D. '08.)
- PAYNE, WM. C. The trend of the elementary school. *Educa. Bi-mo.* 3:148-57. (D. '08.)
- PEARSON, H. G., BENNETT, MARTHA T., AND WARD, ANDREW H. New England Association of Teachers of English: report of the standing committee on entrance requirements. *School R.* 16:646-59. (D. '08.)
- PRICHETT, HENRY S. The organization of higher education. *Atlan.* 102:783-88. (D. '08.)
- (The) problem of adapting history to children in the elementary school. *Teach. Coll. Rec.* 16:1-348. (D. '08.)
- RIIS, JACOB. Riis on play and playgrounds. *Journ. of Education. (Bost.)* 68:591-92. (D. '08.)
- SCHWARZ, HERMANN. The study of experimental pedagogy in Germany. *School R.* 16:633-45. (D. '08.)
- SHEARIN, HUBERT C. Trend of education in the South. *South. Educa. R.* 5:131-34. (N. '08.)
- SIES, RAYMOND W. The study of education in the high school. *School R.* 16:670-79. (D. '08.)
- SISSON, EDWARD O. Reading versus translating. Pt. 2, methods. *School R.* 16:664-69. (D. '08.)
- (The) springs of Australian character. *Educa. R.* 36:475-83. (D. '08.)
- STECHE, WILLIAM A. The playgrounds under the Philadelphia board of public education. *Amer. Phys. Educa. R.* 13:468-71. (N. '08.)
- STEVENS, W. LECONTE. College standardization. *Pop. Sci. Mo.* 73:528-39. (D. '08.)
- THILLY, FRANK. Paulson on modern education. *Educa. R.* 36:458-70. (D. '08.)
- VINCENT, GEORGE E. The individualizing duty of the library. *Pub. Lib.* 13:391-97. (D. '08.)
- WAHLSTROM, LEONARD W. A school print shop. *Man. Train. Mag.* 10:134-47. (D. '08.)
- WITMER, LIGHTNER. The treatment and cure of a case of mental and moral deficiency. *Psycholog. Clin.* 2:153-79. (N. '08.)

